THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Vol. I JULY, 1920 No. 1

THE CREDENTIALS OF OUR COMMUNION

The year 1920 is likely to prove an unusually eventful one in the history of the Church of England. In common with other religious bodies she has recently passed through a period of testing and crisis. She has been subjected to much criticism, and accused of failure in various directions. It is not the purpose of these articles to investigate the justice of these criticisms, or to consider the various suggestions which have been made for improvement in different directions. It is, however, clear that these matters will be carefully considered by the great conference of Anglican Bishops which is about to meet at Lambeth, and in view of this meeting it may be worth while to pass in review certain important facts relating to the history and theological position of our communion. It is perhaps still too early to generalize as to the effects of the war on religion, and it must be sufficiently clear to many that most of the generalizations that have already been made are both premature and superficial. But one thing is plainly evident, and that is that among religious persons the idea of the reunion of Christendom is assuming an ever-growing importance. Our divisions appear to be an intolerable burden, and projects for reunion are to be met with in almost every quarter. One or two facts are especially worthy of attention.

Our relation with the orthodox Church of the East is undergoing something like a complete change, and the possibility of reunion with this great body is a fact of almost overwhelming importance. Any action which could in the smallest degree prejudice this possibility would be, to say the least, exceedingly unwise, for it is quite likely that the events of the next few years will justify us in regarding such reunion not only as possible, but as actually probable. Secondly, there is the question of our relation to the Latin Church, and here it must be confessed that matters look no more hopeful than heretofore. Nevertheless, it is not in itself impossible that the Latin Communion may in some measure be influenced by the great stream of democratic thought which for many years past has been gathering in volume, and for which the circumstances of the last few years have provided the inevitable outlet. At the

81754 v.1 1920

moment it would appear that the Vatican may be left as the sole representative of autocracy. It is, however, possible that this may not be the case, and that certain modifications in her attitude may bring about a rapprochement between the English and Roman Churches which has hitherto seemed hopeless. Lastly, we must bear in mind certain movements of thought among the Nonconformist bodies which have resulted in a better understanding of the historic episcopate and the sacramental system. Each of these tendencies appears to point in the direction of reunion, but none of them is quite so important in itself as the realization of the intolerable nature of separation. But in considering each, or any of these, it is necessary to have clearly before our minds those principles for which the Anglican Communion has always stood, and to attempt to formulate a reasonable scientific and theological justification for them. It is also desirable to try and ascertain how far these particular principles are in accordance with modern thought, and to investigate the direction in which they are likely to lead us in the future. This is, in fact, the object of these articles, and it will be found convenient to divide our inquiry into three heads.

The first question that will occupy our attention will be the question of "Faith"—that is to say, the attitude of our Communion towards the dogmatic formularies of the Catholic Church, her Creeds and Conciliar Definitions. When this is done it will be necessary to turn our attention to the question of "Order," which will involve the consideration of certain historical problems, and the attempt to apply the lessons of history to the present time. It will be desirable to follow up these two investigations by an attempt to justify the position reached on scientific theological grounds, to attempt, in fact, a justification of the *via media* which, though open to attack by either side, may after all prove in the long run to be the path which in the end shall lead to the fullest realization of the Church's mission of universality.

I.

First, then, let us consider the attitude of our Communion towards the Creeds and those conciliar definitions which have been accepted by Catholic Christendom.

The Reformation Settlement in this country introduced no modification of any sort into these formularies; their authority was not called in question, and those which had been employed in public worship were retained and had in use. The Nicene faith found doughty champions among the Caroline divines, and though Latitudinarianism had its supporters among the Anglican clergy, it never obtained any official recognition by the Church, and was

combated alike by the Evangelical and Catholic revivals. In this respect the Church of England can be most clearly differentiated from all Protestant and Nonconformist bodies. She has retained the Catholic formularies as the standard of orthodoxy, and has never permitted any latitude in their interpretation. She possesses also within herself the necessary disciplinary machinery for enforcing conformity, and if in the past she has hesitated to use coercive measures, she has, perhaps for this very reason, maintained a fairly high standard of public opinion on this matter.

Now, recent years have seen the dogmas of the Catholic Church subjected to much hostile criticism in all parts of the world. During the nineteenth century many of the Protestant bodies have almost completely abandoned their old orthodox position. This is especially and particularly true of Germany, and to a lesser extent of certain Nonconformist bodies in England. In the Roman Communion the rise of modernism appeared at one time to threaten the very foundations of Latin theology, and not many years ago that movement had assumed such wide proportions that very drastic measures had to be taken to suppress it. In our own Communion the Liberal movement, which is the Anglican counterpart of Modernism, has found powerful and able advocates, and has secured a considerable following among intellectuals. We will here consider briefly the tendencies of thought which lie behind these movements.

It is the custom of the opponents of Catholic dogma to describe the formularies of the Church as antiquated, expressed in terms of a discarded philosophy, and devoid of interest or authority for the modern man. We are repeatedly informed that restatement is necessary. The controversies, we are told, of the past have no vital relation to the religion of the present day. We are invited to take a pragmatist view of religion. The lessons of history are often adduced in support of the acceptance of a non-dogmatic Christianity. A powerful attack has been levelled against the *a priori* methods of the theologian, which it is contended are contrary to the approved modern and scientific method, and are based on premisses which can no longer be substantiated in view of the accepted results of literary and historical criticism.

It must frankly be admitted that there is much justice in this method of attack. The old view of "the deposit of faith" can scarcely be defended in the manner in which it was upheld by scholars of past generations. The application of the Vincentian Canon is no longer as easy as it appeared to our forefathers, but it may be contended that if the theologian of to-day can no longer employ the methods of his predecessors, he is in possession of new ideas and facts which will prove of greater value to him than any that he had heretofore employed.

Nor should it be forgotten that theology has never been behindhand in employing the newest weapons from the armoury of intellectual discovery. St. Thomas Aquinas was accounted, and rightly accounted, in his own time, a bold and original thinker, and men of such different calibre and tradition as Newman and Ritschl have been forward in applying categories derived from scientific thought to theological problems almost before these had been made use of in any other department of history or philosophy.

One of the great landmarks in modern thought is the recognition of the validity of religious experience. We owe this perhaps to William James more than to any other writer, and it must be confessed that had the validity of religious experience been admitted by such writers of the Victorian age as Huxley and others, their whole attitude to Christianity would have been entirely different. Now it is the recognition of the validity of religious experience which enables the theologian to defend the dogmas of the Catholic Church on lines which are free from the reproach which attaches to the *a priori* method. It enables him also to make a free and complete use of the results of historical and literary criticism. He is no longer forced to adopt the theory that the faith was delivered in its complete form at the beginning, and that the function of the Church consisted primarily, if not entirely, in its explication. He sees in Catholic dogma the necessary and progressive intellectual expression of this vital religious experience, and while admitting the necessity of restatement in certain particulars, he is careful to see that such restatement is not in fact the statement of another experience. He could not assert that the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem was already possessed of that knowledge which some four hundred years later found its expression in the definitions of Chalcedon. Nevertheless he would assert a continuity of religious experience between those who constituted those two assemblies. By rearranging chronologically the writings of the New Testament it is possible to trace the growth of this experience and to note the stages by which it found more or less adequate expression. The ancient document which underlies the early chapters of the Acts is, indeed, far removed in terminology from the later Epistles of St. Paul or the Johannine writings; yet it is not difficult to perceive that the same religious experience underlies both, though it required years to mature, and the inspired genius of a St. Paul or a St. John to evolve the necessary terminology. The careful study of the controversies of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries demonstrates a similar conclusion. The formularies of Nicæa and Chalcedon are the inevitable development of the intellectual expression of the continued experience of the Church. In the light of history it is now possible to assert that no other expression would have been

adequate for this experience, and consequently the continuity of religious experience in succeeding ages can only be guaranteed by the acceptance of these same formularies. The well-known epigram that the Church of the Nicene age was divided on the subject of an iota could not now be defended by an intelligent agnostic or atheist. It must be perfectly clear to anyone that Christian experience could have found no other possible expression than the "homoöusion," and that the acceptance of the "homoiousion" would have meant the gradual slipping back of the Christian world into polytheism. Had the doctrine of Apollinaris prevailed, the Christian world would have been committed to the worship of one who was neither God nor man. Had the Nestorian doctrine carried conviction any reasonable theory of soteriology would have been impossible, while the acceptance of Monophytism would have necessarily led to a religion incompatible with the Christian ethic. The so-called definition of Chalcedon is not a definition, but a statement of fact, and it may now be seen that the facts there asserted are the only facts compatible with the whole stream of continued Christian experience. It is certainly worthy of note that the Creeds and conciliar utterances of the Church offer as a rule no word of explanation of her dogmas. They assert facts, and it is here contended that these facts are the only ones which adequately represent the religious experience which lies behind them; but of these facts as a rule they offer no explanation whatever. A careful examination of the language employed will also show that they are not tied down to any particular school of philosophy, but rather employ terms which are for the most part common to all schools. If the theory of Apollinaris be contrasted with the definition of Chalcedon, this becomes apparent at once. The theory of Apollinaris contains an explanation in terms of a particular philosophy of the fact of the Incarnation. It is an ingenious theory, and possibly the evidence in our possession is not sufficient to enable us to know it in all its detail. Nevertheless, it is an explanation, and it is expressed quite clearly in terms of a particular philosophy which most persons would be entirely unable to accept at the present day. It explains, however, only some of the facts, and would inevitably land those who accepted it in the difficulties mentioned above. If we contrast with this the definition of Chalcedon we perceive the difference. It explains nothing, but merely makes certain assertions, but those assertions are compatible with all the facts, and have at various times been explained in terms of more than one philosophy.

It is at least possible that the best explanation of the assertions of Chalcedon has yet to be made in terms of a philosophy hitherto undiscovered, but in spite of the view of some writers it seems very difficult to prove that they contain anything whatever that is

contrary to the best categories of modern thought. The doctrine of personality, as understood by the modern philosopher, may be exactly what is needed for their right explanation, for it is the function of the theologian to apply the best categories of thought which are known to him to the explanation of the dogmas of the Church. The right attitude appears to be something like this: in order to safeguard the unity and continuity of her experience, the Church has found it necessary from time to time to make certain precise and dogmatic statements. It is, however, generally agreed that these statements are of a negative rather than of a positive character, and that their function is rather to close certain paths than to open others. Now it is just at this point that the function of the theologian becomes necessary and evident. He must bring forth from his treasure things both new and old, and without explaining away the dogmatic statements of the Church offer such explanation of them as his knowledge of philosophy and history will permit. If the dogmas of the Church possess the objectivity which they claim they ought to be capable of explanation in terms of more than one philosophy, and as a matter of fact this has been the case. St. Thomas Aquinas was regarded as a bold thinker and innovator in his own day, when he fearlessly applied the Aristotelian categories to the explanation of Catholic dogma. The attempt that he made was eminently successful in his own time, but to a large extent was not of permanent value. The dogmas of the Catholic Church remain, and are still found to be an adequate expression of continuous Christian experience, but there seems to be no reason to refrain from the attempt to explicate them in terms of a philosophy unknown to the schoolmen. Indeed, such attempts have been made, and are being made, with no small measure of success, and the orthodoxy of an Illingworth is at least as genuine as that of St. Thomas Aquinas, even though his methods of apologetic may differ in almost every respect.

The one perfectly fatal error into which the theologian may fall only too easily is the view that any particular explanation of dogma is of necessity binding on those who accept the dogma itself. The older apologetic was altogether vitiated by this point of view, and it is to a large extent characteristic of many theologians of the Latin Communion. Modernism was in fact little more than a violent reaction from this point of view. The whole scholastic method was hastily and somewhat inconsiderately abandoned, and a pragmatist point of view substituted, which altogether imperilled the objectivity of Catholic dogma, and insisted on a view of religious experience which was severed from historical fact in such a way as to endanger its ethical basis. The fact that very few among liberal theologians in England went to the same lengths as the more

extreme modernists in France and Italy is probably due to the fact that they were trained in a school of greater intellectual freedom. It is this atmosphere of intellectual freedom which is a ground of hope that the English theologians will in the future, as to some extent in the past, do important work on orthodox yet constructive lines. The contribution which our Communion is capable of making to the maintenance of the standard of Catholic orthodoxy is very great, and this is especially due to the fact that those English theologians who have wholeheartedly accepted Catholic dogma have clearly perceived that it is impossible to insist as a matter of faith on the acceptance of any particular form of the explanation of this dogma. They have to a large extent been free from certain obvious drawbacks which have attended the labours of the theologians of the Orthodox Church of the East, and the break with scholasticism which was effected at the time of the Reformation has of necessity driven them in search of new methods, many of which have proved highly successful.

The strength of our position may be best illustrated by a reference to recent controversies on the subject of Biblical criticism. It was thought at one time that if the results of the higher criticism of the Bible were accepted, they would of necessity imperil the very basis of the Christian position. This, as far as our Communion is concerned, has certainly not been the case. With Continental Protestantism and English Nonconformity it has been far otherwise. The necessary abandonment of the doctrine of verbal inspiration has produced far-reaching results. We are confronted on the one hand with a reactionary attitude, which will fail to carry any conviction with the rising generation, and on the other with a form of liberal doctrine which in many cases is not far removed from Unitarianism. If we turn once more to the Modernist movement we shall see that the results are very similar. The most extreme Modernists accepted with a singular lack of discrimination the most startling theories of German and Dutch criticism. Yet, maintaining as they did the validity of Catholic experience, they were driven to present to the world a religion which had no real basis in objective historic events. The experience on which they rested so much was in many cases based, according to their view, on little more than hallucination, and consequently, as stated above, their whole theory was lacking in objectivity, and open to serious ethical difficulty. The opponents of Modernism went to the other extreme, and the result of the whole controversy has been the publication of certain official statements with regard to Biblical science which must of necessity confine the Latin theologian within the narrowest limits, and prevent him from using some of the most valuable weapons from the armoury of modern apologetic.

The theologians of the Anglican Communion have as a whole taken an entirely different line. They have shown a greater discrimination in dealing with the results of Biblical science, and owing to their tradition of intellectual freedom have pursued their investigations with a candour and fearlessness which has produced admirable results. Of course, all this did not happen without a struggle, and many of us remember the strenuous times in which *Lux Mundi* made its appearance. Yet those days seem far removed now, and it may be confidently asserted that the battle has been fought and won, and that Anglican theologians have as a whole avoided the pitfalls which beset them on either side. They have not followed blindly in the wake of critics whose labours would have received no serious consideration in any other department of literature, nor have they shrunk into the shadows of an obscurantism which would of necessity have produced a violent reaction among the rising generation.

What has been the result of this? It is now possible to defend the doctrine of inspiration of Scripture on new and scientific grounds. The Old Testament, chronologically rearranged, has been cleared of moral and intellectual difficulties, and is shown to be in a truer sense than ever before an inspired record of the Divine preparation for the Incarnation of the Son of God. The meaning of the opening words of the Epistle to the Hebrews has at last been made manifest, and it is now possible to offer a reasoned theory of the *præparatio evangelica* both within the Old Testament itself, and also within the records of heathen antiquity.

With regard to the New Testament the advantage is equally apparent. A century of criticism of the Gospels has resulted in the presentation of the historic Christ in such a form as to uphold the validity of the Chalcedonian definition—of one substance with the Father as touching His Godhead, of one substance with us men as touching His Manhood. There is at least a hope that in this matter, if Anglican theology be true to its best traditions, it may ultimately present the world with something like a synthesis of the contending schools of Antioch and Alexandria. It has learned not a little from modern criticism which it will find of great value in maintaining unimpaired the picture of the historic Christ, and by reason of its acceptance of Catholic tradition it will be enabled alike to avoid the error of Nestorius and of Eutyches.

Lastly, the scientific study of the Pauline and Johannine writings has resulted in the establishment of the doctrine of development within the New Testament itself, and the discovery of a continuous religious experience gradually if painfully finding for itself the necessary terminology for its intellectual expression. And this process, as we have seen, continues after the close of the New Testa-

ment Canon, and the record of its organic development is to be found in the Creeds and conciliar definitions of the Church.

To the faithful upholding of these Creeds and definitions the Anglican Communion is committed by her formularies. If we are right in our contention she is perhaps better fitted than any other body of Catholic Christians to defend those Creeds and definitions from the attacks of modern infidelity, and to prove that in the twentieth, as well as in the thirteenth century, they are capable of interpretation and defence in terms of contemporary thought.

H. LEONARD PASS.

(To be continued.)

ST. PAUL IN RELATION TO OUR LORD

A CORRESPONDENT wrote to me not long ago to the effect that he wished that students working at St. Paul would show that he was "a Catholic theologian, and not a liberal Protestant." Though that is not exactly the aim of the present article, it will be found, at least, to bear upon the question. The literary problems offered by the Pauline epistles are numerous and interesting, but they will not here come under consideration. It is not at all a vital question whether St. Paul wrote the Pastoral Epistles, or Ephesians, or how many letters he wrote to Corinth, or when and where he wrote Galatians or Philippians, or whether Romans xvi. was originally a separate letter to Ephesus, and so on. What is really vital is this—Does the Christian religion, with its organ the Church, come to us from Jesus Christ, or must it be traced to a different and later origin in the mind of St. Paul? Did St. Paul overshadow Jesus so that the religion of the Prophet of Nazareth largely faded out of sight? Was the religion of Jesus the earlier writing of a palimpsest which has been saved from obliteration in recent years by the skill of criticism, and the recovery of which renders the later Pauline subject-matter comparatively worthless? As typical of this attitude let us take some remarks of Wrede:* "If we do not wish to deprive both figures [Jesus and Paul] of all historical distinctness, the name "disciple of Jesus" has little applicability to Paul, if it is used to denote an historical relation. In comparison with Jesus Paul is essentially a new phenomenon, as new, considering the large basis of common ground [of Old Testament and Jewish thought], as he could possibly be. He stands much farther away from Jesus than Jesus Himself stands from the noblest figures of Jewish piety. . . . The life-work and life-picture of Jesus did *not* determine the Pauline theology. . . . He, indeed, felt himself to be a disciple

* *Paul*, trans. Lummis, p. 165 f.

and Apostle of Jesus and felt it his honour to be so; he was not conscious of his innovations. But in view of the facts this is really far enough from proving that he was only a continuator of Jesus' work, and that he understood Jesus; and, besides, the being whose disciple and Apostle he wished to be was not actually the historical man Jesus, but another."

Wrede, then, is one of those who assume that it is right to say Jesus *or* Christ, the Jesus of history *or* the Christ of experience. No one must be blamed for having presuppositions; it is impossible for the human mind to approach any problem with the blank emptiness of a *tabula rasa ;* presuppositions due to heredity and environment there must inevitably be. When a presupposition has been *proved* to be mistaken, the scientific mind will, of course, be humble enough to delete it; but until that takes place, the most scientific and honest inquiry tends to be affected by it. The presupposition of Wrede and his school, that He whose apostle St. Paul claimed to be " was not actually the historical man Jesus, but another," underlies the greater part of their criticism. Anyone who believes in the Resurrection, or, to put it in another way, who believes that there is a real personal continuity between the human Jesus and the glorified Christ, that the words " I am Jesus " in the Damascus vision stand for a concrete fact, shares the presupposition of St. Paul which has been inherited by the Catholic Church. Jesus was " marked out as Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness, by resurrection from death." If that is not true, then was the Apostle's teaching vain, and our faith is also vain. But for Wrede, to whom this is " mythological," there is no bridge between the human Jesus and the glorified Christ; if the bridge is removed, the chasm is, of course, impassable.

Wrede lays stress on two points (*op. cit.*, 147, 151): First, that " the picture of Christ did not originate in an impression of the personality of Jesus "; and second, that " Paul believed in such a celestial being, in a divine Christ, before he believed in Jesus." How much he could have known of the personality of the human Jesus before he formulated his thoughts in his epistles is a matter which we must examine, and in which there is room, perhaps, for different estimates. But the second statement is more serious, and must be dealt with first. Wrede rejects the theory that the apostle himself exalted Jesus into the heavenly Son of God; " but in the moment of conversion, when Jesus appeared before him in the shining glory of His risen existence, Paul identified Him with his own Christ, and straightway transferred to Jesus all the conceptions which he already had of the celestial being." If so, we can only say that the conceptions which, as a Jew, he already had of the Messiah were higher and nobler than those of any other Jew known to us.

Many Jews, indeed, expected a Messiah who was existent in heaven before appearing on earth. But where in Jewish literature is there anything to suggest that he was divine, as St. Paul understood divinity?—*ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων*, "being in the form of God" (Phil. ii. 6). Where is there a trace of the conception of his Being and Nature such as is involved in the relationship with the Father and the Holy Spirit expressed in many passages in the Pauline epistles? The highest and most spiritual Jewish thought before our Lord succeeded only in hoping for something that was impossible. A heavenly Son of God, who was less than God, and more than man, a semi-divine *tertium quid*, the product of troubled longings and devout imaginations, was not the indwelling Christ of St. Paul's spiritual experience. "Here again," says Wrede, "we see the great importance of the fact that he had not known Jesus. Intimate disciples could not so readily believe that the Man with whom they had sat at table in Capernaum, or sailed on the Lake of Galilee, was the Creator of the world. But in Paul's way there was no such obstacle." We need not delay to discuss how much the intimate disciples were ready to believe about the Man who rose from the dead. But it is implied that Saul of Tarsus before his conversion had reason to think of the Messiah as the Creator of the world. I do not think that any pre-Christian Jewish writing which we possess contains a shadow of a trace of the idea. The utmost that Wrede can say is "that Jewish apocalyptic books are really cognizant of a Messiah, who before His appearance lives in heaven, and is more exalted than the angels themselves"; and he continues: "Whether, however, every feature in the Pauline Christ can be explained by means of the extant apocalyptic accounts of Messiah, is a question we shall not here attempt to decide." This is hardly fair. Anyone with the most cursory knowledge of the Jewish apocalypses knows that "every feature of the Pauline Christ" cannot be found in them or explained by them. The point is crucial. If there are any features which were absent from his pre-Christian notion of the Messiah, they need to be accounted for. And if Jewish thought will not account for them, the factors which contributed to them must have been—on the one hand, what he managed to learn about our Lord when He was on earth, and on the other, what he grasped as the result of his certainty that the same Lord was henceforth in heaven. And the bridge between the two was the Resurrection, the ground and explanation and centre of cohesion of the whole range of his teaching.

The former of Wrede's two statements quoted above must next be considered: "The picture of Christ did not originate in an impression of the personality of Jesus." We are led to suppose that St. Paul knew virtually nothing about our Lord's earthly life, and

cared less. This is the explanation which is sometimes given of his words in 2 Cor. v. 16: "So that we from henceforth know no one according to the flesh: even if we know Christ according to the flesh, yet now we know Him no longer." We have, it is true, no evidence at all that St. Paul came into actual contact and acquaintance with our Lord in His earthly life, though he may just have met Him in Jerusalem. He is fighting against his Judaizing opponents. And we can imagine the sort of thing that they must have said. They would ask what right he had to preach such a gospel as his; what personal acquaintance with Jesus could he point to as his authorization? And he replies that all this reference to his relations with the earthly Jesus is beside the mark, and does not trouble him. The original Apostles are not nearer to Christ than he, merely because they had lived with Him for a few months or years. He is a new creation, old things have passed away; what matters for him is the risen, glorified Christ. If, in the early days after his conversion, he had tried to learn as much as he could about Christ according to the flesh from those who had walked and talked with Him, yet now all that, in itself, meant nothing to him. It was not the earthly life as such, but the *effects* of the earthly life as followed by death and risen glory which were everything to him. If this is the true explanation, that he is meeting the claims of Judaizing opponents, his words do not mean that Christ's earthly life was unimportant for Christianity, or that he had learnt very little about it—he had probably learnt a good deal—but only that he would not base any claim on his own personal connection with it or knowledge of it. And all subsequent Christians, of course, are in the same position. It is not an authoritative knowledge of our Lord's exact words and actions on earth that matters (if it were, the modern criticism of the Gospels would indeed place us in a precarious position!), or even an accurate impression of His human personality, which to us must of necessity, as regards details, be very dim and imaginary, but living union with Him who was born of a woman, obedient even to the extent of death, the death of the Cross, and therefore highly exalted. The verse which we have been studying really has no bearing on the question how much of our Lord's earthly life was known to St. Paul.

Now, Wrede declares that "the life-work and life-picture of Jesus did *not* determine the Pauline theology." That they did not exclusively determine it goes without saying; but it is implied that they played no part at all in the process.

But, to begin with, is it possible to suppose that a missionary to heathen could have even interested his hearers, not to speak of drawing them to a living faith in Christ, if he had omitted from his preaching as unnecessary all account of His earthly life? His

epistles do not say very much about it, because his readers were already converts, and had been taught it by word of mouth when they were first evangelized. But there is enough to show that he had himself, and assumed in his readers, a knowledge of at any rate the main features of the Lord's human life. The vision on the Damascus road, with the words, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest," would have had no intelligible meaning for him unless he had known something about the "Jesus" spoken of, as well as something about the heavenly Messiah. In 1 Cor. vii. 10, when he refers to our Lord's prohibition of divorce, he has before his eyes a real Man, a human Teacher. In 2 Cor. x. 1 he entreats them "by the meekness and gentleness of Christ," a real trait in the character of a real Man of flesh and blood. Phil. ii. 8: "He humbled Himself, becoming obedient even to the extent of death, the death of the Cross"—*i.e.*, obedient right through His earthly life up to the Cross which was its culmination. That earthly, human obedience was for St. Paul part of the means of the world's salvation; and it could not have been that, had not the Jesus of history and the Christ of experience been identified by means of the Resurrection. Again, the parallel which he draws between the First and the Second Adam (Rom. v. 12 ff.), if it is to have any real meaning, must imply a real human life which afforded to Jesus, as to Adam, time and opportunity to decide between good and evil. The reality of His humanity, of His temptations, of His need of choice, is required by St. Paul's theology. As Jülicher says: "Within these verses as a frame he leaves room for the whole content of the Gospel history."

Once more, the death of Christ is all in all to him. And he knows more than the mere fact of the death. In 1 Cor. xi. 23-25 he shows a knowledge of the Last Supper, and that Jesus was betrayed, and by night. And even if he did not write 1 Tim. vi. 13, he must have known that the punishment of crucifixion was inflicted by Pontius Pilate. Look also at Gal. iii. 1: "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you?—before whose eyes Jesus Christ was publicly written [προεγράφη, displayed, placarded] as crucified." Does not that mean that in his first preaching to the Galatians the Apostle drew the most vivid and heart-stirring word-pictures of the scene of the crucifixion?

Further, those who think that he knew little or nothing about our Lord's life on earth do not take account of the fact that he persecuted Christians for some time. They, of course, had trials in the synagogues or before the Sanhedrin, and they would be asked all sorts of questions in his hearing about the Jesus whom they proclaimed to be the Messiah. All the time that he was "kicking against the goads" he was kicking against the impressions which he had received of the personality of the human Jesus. And these

impressions appear in another way. In Gal. ii. 20 he says: "Christ liveth in me," the omnipotent, immanent Divine Being. And yet in the very same verse he shows that he has given himself up heart and soul in love to a Person "who loved me and gave Himself up for me." If his knowledge of the heavenly Messiah was only the knowledge that he had possessed before his conversion, it is difficult to see how he could have learnt to love Him. All that he says about Christ's love, grace, gentleness, kindness, meekness, arises from his certainty that Christ was Man. No Jewish writings or expectations known to us could have given him the slightest suggestion that the Messiah was a Being of sympathy, tenderness, and love.

We can now go on to further points at which it is claimed that there was a complete break, a chasm, between the human Jesus and St. Paul. On the one hand, our Lord said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel"; and sending out the Twelve on their mission He told them not to go to the Gentiles, or to any city of the Samaritans, "but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." On the other hand, St. Paul claimed, and fought vehemently for his claim, to be the Apostle of the Gentiles. This might seem to be a new departure. We know how the Judaizers said: "Gentiles may certainly become Christians, but they must do so *via* Judaism; they must be circumcised before they are baptized; they must be members of the Jewish Church before they can be members of the Christian Church." And St. Paul fought with all the tumultuous energy that he possessed for the freedom of Gentiles from the yoke of the Law. And at the council at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 1-29) he won; he gained the victory which has saved the Christian Church from being a Jewish sect. Does not this make a chasm between Jesus and St. Paul? Such a question is possible only for those who cannot accept a Resurrection of such a kind as to supply a bridge over the chasm. If the heavenly Messiah was not really and truly the human Jesus, but only a traditional figure of Jewish imagination identified in the Apostle's thoughts with the Galilean Prophet who had recently died, then the chasm is impassable; Gentile Christianity, as St. Paul with his splendid universalism conceived of it, was a new departure. But it was not, if the human Jesus was really "marked out as Son of God . . . by the Resurrection." When our Lord was in the flesh, He was subject to human limitations. Omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, are prerogatives which we ascribe to God; we do not ascribe them to a Man who revealed God. He shared the belief of the whole of His nation from the days of the prophets that Israel was divinely chosen to be the means of bringing the world to God. Israel was to be the light to the Gentiles. Israel must therefore be first converted. But when He had passed through death to His risen glory, and the

divine prerogatives could be ascribed to Him, St. Paul realized what was involved in an omnipresent Christ. The germ of universalism in the Old Testament and in our Lord's teaching could now spring into full growth. Gentiles need no longer be gathered into the Jewish Church in order to draw near to God. What they need is to be gathered into Christ, where Jew and Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond and free, are all one. Christians are the Jewish Church as it ought to be.

The same explanation is required for our Lord's words, "The Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for *many*," as compared, for example, with the Pauline thought expressed in 1 Tim. ii. 6: "Christ Jesus who gave Himself a ransom for *all*." The former should be compared with Isa. liii. 12: "He bore the sin of many." "Many" is the nation contrasted with His single Self, whose death was to work their national salvation. The Resurrection, and nothing but the Resurrection, revealed to St. Paul the necessary logical universality of salvation in Christ; it supplied the conditions which developed the soteriology of the Apostle out of that of his Master.

Closely bound up with this is the machinery of salvation, if we may call it so—the Church and the Sacraments.

It is said that our Lord never intended to found a Church; but that St. Paul was impressed with the wonderful colonial organization of the Empire, controlled by the Emperor, its head, by means of high-roads, and postal arrangements, and shipping routes, and that, proud of all this as a Roman citizen, he conceived the idea of the Church as an analogous world-wide organization, each member performing his appointed function for the good of the whole, all kept in coherence and control by Christ, the Head, from whom the whole Body, supplied and knit together through the joints and bands, increaseth with the increase of God. There are two passages in which Jesus is said to have used the word *ecclesia*—(1) Matt. xviii. 17: "If he refuse to hear them, tell it to the Church, and if he refuse to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a Gentile and a customs officer." It is very improbable that this is a genuine utterance of His. (2) Matt. xvi. 18: "On this rock I will build My Church." The genuineness of this is often denied, but with much less reason. Our Lord had selected and called a small body of followers,* and He could describe them as His "congregation," which is the meaning of the Aramaic word that He probably used. But even if He never used the word Church, His followers did in fact consist of men and women who formed a distinct Body, and His Spirit did in fact fill that Body at Pentecost, and every Christian on whom the Apostles subsequently laid their hands. The Spirit

* That He thought of them as a distinct body is suggested also by Luke xii. 32: "Fear not, little flock."

of the glorified Christ quite obviously filled and knit together the Body, long before St. Paul was converted. His metaphor drawn from the Roman Empire was only his vivid way of describing an actual state of things already in existence. Of course, if the Spirit at Pentecost was *not* the Spirit of the risen Jesus, if the Lord bequeathed to subsequent ages only the inspiring memory and example of a supremely holy life, then St. Paul in his conception of the Church did evolve from his inner consciousness something radically new, and Catholic Christianity, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, has not the human, risen Jesus as its corner-stone.

Lastly, the Church has her Sacraments. It is claimed that St. Paul's sacramental teaching is an entirely new departure, and that our Lord never intended that there should be any Sacraments. As a Hellenist there is no doubt that the Apostle had some acquaintance with the Greek mysteries, and it is from them that he is said to have derived his ideas about Baptism and the Eucharist. He certainly derived some of his *language* from them. The frequent use of the word μυστήριον, "mystery," which occurs some twenty times in his epistles, is an instance. To the Philippians (iv. 12) he says: "In everything and in all things I have been *initiated* [R.V., learned the secret] both to be filled," etc. Those who were initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries were said to have arrived at a condition of τελετή (completeness of sacramental knowledge and experience); and in 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7 he writes: "We speak wisdom among the τέλειοι" (those who have reached maturity of Christian knowledge and experience); and the same adjective occurs in other passages with much the same force. The privilege of the pagan worshipper who reached this final and highest condition was ἐποπτεία, the face-to-face vision which united him with his God; and St. Paul says (1 Cor. xiii. 10): "When that which is τέλειον, 'perfect,' is come, that which is partial will be done away. Now we see through a mirror obscurely, but then face to face." And there are many other cases in which his language is reminiscent of the primitive rites which survived in the form of the mysteries till a comparatively late date. If he could use metaphors from the Greek games, there is no reason why he should not have borrowed vocabulary from the mysteries.

But some writers think that he did much more than that. The pagan worshipper wanted to unite himself with the life of his God, especially with the God who died and rose again, and whose death and resurrection are perpetuated in the annual death and renewal in the vegetable world, and the continual death and reproduction of species in the animal world. By a rite of purification, and by partaking in the life-blood of the God, he attained his object. Salvation was to be won by a knowledge of the mysteries. There, it is

maintained, is the source of St. Paul's sacramental teaching. To the God who died and rose again we are united by Baptism (Rom. vi. 3, 4) and by partaking of His Body and Blood (1 Cor. x. 16, 17). St. Paul's hellenism occasioned a new departure, completely separate from the teaching of Jesus.

It is true that we do not, in all probability, know anything for certain about our Lord's teaching on Baptism, because it is unsafe to assume that the words of either Matthew (xxviii. 19) or John (iii. 3, 5) were actually spoken by Him. But it is quite clear that if Christian Baptism was a new departure, it was not originated by St. Paul. He assumes, for instance, that the Roman Christians, whom he had not visited and taught in person, already knew not only the practice but the meaning of Baptism: " Know ye not that as many of us as were baptized unto Christ Jesus were baptized into His death ?" (Rom. vi. 2). And he speaks of it also, not as setting forth something new, but as part of his argument, in 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13, which is earlier than Romans, and in Gal. iii. 27, which is perhaps much earlier still, in both cases with the same doctrine. As regards the practice, no one questions the fact that Baptism " in, or into, the name of Jesus " was administered by Jewish Christians from the very day of Pentecost, and, moreover, was clearly understood to be distinct from the rite connected with the name of John the Baptist and from all previous Jewish washings. If our Lord formed the nucleus of a new " congregation," the immediate and universal adoption of Baptism by the Church makes it very probable that He Himself enjoined it as the means of incorporating new members. What that incorporation involved became clear after He was glorified. It was realized by everyone who experienced the gift of the Messiah's Spirit; no Greek rite of purification was needed to teach him.

With regard to the Holy Communion, some writers have hardly escaped the circular position: Jesus gave no sacramental teaching, and St. Paul's is therefore a new departure; Jesus is reported to have given sacramental teaching in the words, " This is My Body " and " This is My Blood of the covenant, which is shed for many " (Mark xiv. 22, 24), and this is therefore a Pauline feature introduced into the Gospel. There is somewhat stronger support for the contention that our Lord did not command a continuance of the rite, and that St. Paul transformed an evening meal for twelve men into an abiding Sacrament. The words " This do in remembrance of Me " occur in the ordinary text of Luke xxii. 19,* but not in cod. Bezæ (D) and several Old Latin MSS. It is possible, though the theory is not without difficulties, that material has been imported from 1 Cor. xi. 23-25. Even if it was, the continuance of the rite

* Which the present writer still believes to be the true one; see his *St. Matthew*, p. 385 f.

was not due to St. Paul. From the very first all Christians, having been baptized into Jesus Christ, united regularly and frequently in the breaking of bread as a religious act of fellowship. If it was not due to our Lord's command, it was a direct and deliberate imitation of the Last Supper; and to do that without a remembrance of the Lord's death was impossible. St. Paul cannot be held responsible either for the permanent repetition of the act, or for the sacramental, sacrificial significance attaching to it. The utmost that we can say is that in formulating his Christian doctrine, the mysteries may have helped him to realize more vividly that all the wealth of spiritual blessing at which they aimed was to be reached in the mystery of Christ, and Christ alone.*

A. H. McNeile.

FLETCHER OF MADELEY

I.

So we call him—"John Fletcher of Madeley," and a fine British ring the words have about them. Yet "John Fletcher" he was not. Jean Guillaume de la Fléchère was a Swiss, born at Nyon, a town about fifteen miles north of Geneva, on September 12, 1729. His father, a distant connection of the Counts of Savoy, had been an officer in the French Army, and afterwards became a colonel in the Swiss militia.

John, as we will call him, was his youngest son, and spent his youth at Nyon, passing on to Geneva University for his later education. From childhood he was most industrious, loving his lessons and books. When at Geneva he would spend whole nights in studying philosophy, theology, languages (including Hebrew), and mathematics.

Bred to an outdoor life, he had, in early childhood, many adventures, some with no small risk of life. On one occasion, when he was fencing with his elder brother, the button came off the point of his opponent's foil, which penetrated his side and scarred him for life.

The Lake of Geneva, with all its allurements, proved a source of danger to the adventurous lads. On one occasion he and his brother found themselves alone in a little boat on the lake, out of sight of land and darkness coming on. Only the ringing of church bells, which guided them to shore, saved the lads from what might have been disaster. On another occasion, whilst he was swimming in the lake, the stout ribbon which fastened his hair somehow got

* See *St. Paul: His Life, Letters, and Christian Doctrine*, pp. 305-307.

twisted round his leg, preventing him from swimming, and only loosing itself when, giving himself up for lost, he ceased to struggle.

It is not surprising that his parents destined the boy for the Swiss Protestant ministry, and urged their wishes upon him as he grew older. John himself, however, was eager for the army. When, for various reasons, his plans for that career failed, he came to England on a visit. Seeking to perfect himself in the English tongue, he stayed for eighteen months with a schoolmaster at Hatfield. From there he took a post as tutor to the two sons of a Mr. Hill at Tern Hall, in Shropshire, where he spent the next eight years.

So far young Fletcher had had strong religious feelings, but had experienced little or no sense of personal sin. This was to come through his connection with the "Methodists," with whom he became acquainted in the following manner: Mr. Hill, when attending to his parliamentary duties, was wont to take his family and Fletcher to London with him. On one journey to the City, the party stopped at St. Albans, and John, who went out for a stroll in the town, did not rejoin them until after they had started again for London. Asked why he was late, he answered: "As I was walking I met an old woman, who talked so sweetly of Jesus Christ that I knew not how the time passed away." Whereupon Mrs. Hill remarked: "I shall not wonder if our tutor does not turn Methodist before long!" "Methodist, madam," quoth John, "and pray, what is that?" "The Methodists," she answered, "are a people that do nothing but pray. They are praying all day and all night." "Are they?" said he. "Then, by the help of God, I will find them out, if they be above ground." And shortly he did find them out, and was admitted into the Society, attending their meetings whenever he was in London.

In the Methodist meetings he discovered that a change of heart was necessary for him, if he was to be really happy. Gradually he became convinced that his nature, which hitherto he had complacently regarded as religious, was entirely depraved and sinful. In his diary (he was now about twenty-five years of age) he describes his feelings thus (they are precisely similar to those of John Wesley sixteen years before): "I fear my knowledge of Christ is only speculative, and does not reach my heart. *I never had faith;* and without faith it is impossible to please God. Therefore, all my thoughts, words, and works, however specious before men, are utterly sinful before God. And if I am not washed and renewed before I go hence, I am lost to all eternity."

A time of intense depression and striving after peace and pardon followed, in which he spent hours upon his knees or searching the Scriptures, longing for release from the bondage of sin. Then one day, as he was earnest in prayer, lying prostrate on his face before

God, he had a vision of Christ hanging and bleeding on the Cross, and at the same time knew the joy of complete forgiveness.

From now a deep sense of peace took possession of Fletcher's heart, and for the rest of his life never forsook him. His whole manner of looking at things changed. From considering himself exceptionally pious and virtuous, he now felt himself the chief of sinners, and a deep self-abhorrence produced in him both an intense humility and a great joy and thankfulness towards God for His mercies to one so wholly undeserving.

His service of God was now nothing if not whole-hearted, being marked by a very real bearing of the Cross. He made it his rule to sit up two whole nights a week for reading, meditation, and prayer. He lived wholly upon vegetable food, often only on bread, milk, and water.

This asceticism was a strong feature of early Evangelicalism. In these days, when the ordinary "Evangelical" would look upon fasting or any stern self-discipline as superstitious, or at least wholly unnecessary, it is startling to find Fletcher thus disciplining himself, or William Wilberforce, somewhat later, following almost exactly the same course of stern fasting and asceticism in many ways. To men of this stamp human nature was too corrupt to be dealt with by easy methods; the knife must be laid at the very root of bodily desires and indulgence.

II.

God was gradually leading John Fletcher on to the work of the Church's ministry. His newly-found earnestness and his longing that others should share his own joy in Christ led him to preach to, or pray with, others as opportunity offered, and to visit the rich and poor in his neighbourhood. Feeling strongly drawn to Holy Orders, he consulted John Wesley and others; but it was two years before their encouragement overcame his diffidence and modesty. However, an intense sense of gratitude to God made an overwhelming motive for taking the step, and on March 6, 1757, he received deacon's orders at the hands of the Bishop of Bangor, being ordained priest the following Sunday. That same morning he went straight to assist John Wesley in celebrating at West Street Chapel; and at once began to preach, when invited, at various Methodist chapels. These were not, of course, separated as yet from the Church, but were rather places of worship for quickening the spiritual life of awakened Churchmen.

Fletcher was not yet perfect in the English tongue, and for some time he received but few invitations to preach. When he received them, he was divided between a burning desire to deliver his message and an intense humility which made him keenly feel his unworthi-

ness to deliver it. Writing to Wesley soon after his ordination, he says:

> There is, generally, upon my heart, such a sense of my unworthiness, that I sometimes dare hardly open my mouth before a child of God, and think it an unspeakable honour to stand before one who has recovered something of the image of God, or sincerely seeks after it. Is it possible that such a sinful worm as I should have the privilege to converse with one whose soul is sprinkled with the blood of my Lord? The thought amazes, confounds me, and fills my eyes with tears of humble joy. . . . I set out in two days for the country. Oh, may I be faithful! Harmless like a dove, wise like a serpent, and bold as a lion for the common cause! O Lord, do not forsake me! Stand by the weakest of Thy servants, and enable Thy children to bear with me, and wrestle with Thee in my behalf.

About this time Fletcher had an opportunity of preaching in his native tongue to the many French prisoners who were on their parole at Tunbridge, and many were deeply affected by his ministrations.

Whilst still living at Tern Hall, Fletcher began his connection with the parish of Madeley, ten miles distant, a connection which was later to become the closer tie of a permanent pastoral charge, He was often asked by the vicar to take the services at Madeley, or to assist at them, and he came to have a great affection for the place and people.

In 1759 he was offered the living of Dunham in Cheshire, but to the patron's astonishment declined it on the plea that the emoluments were too high and the people too few! Whereupon he was asked if he would undertake Madeley, with its smaller income and its larger population, if the Vicar of Madeley were presented to Dunham. Fletcher immediately and joyfully agreed, and this arrangement was made.

He found the parish in an appalling state. "Madeley," says a contemporary writer, "was remarkable for little else than the ignorance and profaneness of its inhabitants, among whom respect to man was as rarely to be observed as piety towards God. In this benighted place the Sabbath was openly profaned, and the most holy things contemptuously trodden under foot; even the restraints of decency were violently broken through, and the external form of religion held up as a subject of ridicule."

To win his people to God Fletcher gave his whole body and soul to their service. Not content with the Sunday services, he preached daily, generally in the evening, whenever and wherever—in church

or open air or private houses—a small congregation could be gathered. He visited his people assiduously, teaching, exhorting, rebuking. Especially was he conscientious in visitation of the sick, for whom he, like most saintly people, had a great regard and affection.

III.

Desire to bring his flock to a better mind led Fletcher to invite eminent Methodists to his parish from time to time. The brothers Wesley were often asked to officiate in Madeley Church; and, with that indifference to Church order in the matter of episcopal ordination which marked many, though not all, of the Methodists, he was quite prepared to use preachers of any denomination which would help him. With Whitefield also he corresponded, and was on friendly terms with Borridge, Venn, and other leaders in the religious revival of the times. He himself, though occasionally only, owing to ill-health, shared in Methodist preaching outside his own parish.

When the famous Countess of Huntingdon founded her seminary at Trevecca, it was Fletcher whom she invited to act as superintendent. Fletcher could not, of course, forsake his parish to reside at Trevecca, but his duties were to attend as often as he could, to supervise masters and students, and to assist their studies and devotions. By them, according to the testimony of the head-master, he was "received as an angel of God, revered, loved, almost adored."

His connection with the college, however, was not to be for long, for the masterful foundress dismissed the head-master for not holding strict Calvinistic views, and Fletcher thereupon resigned. It was a side issue of the famous controversy between Arminianism and Calvinism, which for a while separated Wesley and Whitefield and caused no slight stir in the religious world.

Into this controversy Fletcher, as a scholar and ready writer, was gradually drawn, and became the chief defender of the Arminian position. Much as he hated controversy, he felt called to defend with all his might the freedom of salvation for all believers. Pamphlet after pamphlet poured from his pen to attack both the predestination to salvation which would allow Antinomianism and evil living, and that predestination to damnation which prejudged any man's hopes of salvation. Wesley, who would not touch the task himself, was glad of so skilled and eloquent a lieutenant, and it was long before Fletcher could lay aside his pen. "I thought," he wrote, after severe application to pamphleteering in addition to his pastoral labours had brought him almost to the grave, "I should soon have done with controversy, but now I give up the hope of

having done with it before I die. There are three sorts of people I must continually attack or defend myself against—Gallios, Pharisees, and Antinomians. I hope I shall die in this harness, fighting against some of them. I do not, however, forget that the Gallio, the Simon, and the Nicolas *within* are far more dangerous to me than those without. In my own heart, that immense field, I must *first* fight the Lord's battles and my own."

IV.

Fletcher's untiring labours, added to his austerity of living, broke down a constitution never strong; and from about 1774 to 1780 he was continually brought to the point of death by the frequent hæmorrhages and intense weakness of pulmonary consumption. In 1776 John Wesley, whose curate three years before Fletcher had suggested he might become, carried him off bodily on one of his tours, and declared that the open-air travelling would have restored the invalid had not his friends taken alarm at the greatness of the journeys and kept him from continuing them. After his life had been many times despaired of, a prolonged visit to his native land —from December, 1777 to 1781—restored him to health and work.

Not that Fletcher, however sick, could be restrained from work altogether. When too weak to preach without hæmorrhages, he would gather children together in the Swiss villages and talk to them of the love of Jesus. Or he would enter earnest argument with some of the many free-thinkers whom he met, and who were generally impressed with his obvious intellectuality and holiness. In one of his letters he gives an interesting account of the deaths of two famous Continental philosophers:

> In one of my letters I promised you some anecdotes concerning the death of our two great philosophers, Voltaire and Rousseau. Mr. Tronchin, the physician of the Duke of Orleans, being sent for to attend Voltaire in his illness at Paris, Voltaire said to him: "Sir, I desire you would save my life. I will give you the half of my fortune if you lengthen out my days only for six months. If not, I will go to the devil, and shall carry you along with me."
>
> Rousseau died more decently, as full of himself as Voltaire was of the wicked one. He paid that attention to Nature and the natural sun which the Christian pays to grace and the Sun of Righteousness. These were some of his last words to his wife, which I copy from a printed paper circulating in these parts: "Open the window, that I may see the green fields once more. How beautiful is Nature! How wonderful is the sun!

See what glorious light it sends forth! It is God who calls me. How pleasing is death to a man who is not conscious of any sin! O God, my soul is now as pure as when it first came out of Thy hands: crown it with Thy heavenly bliss!" God deliver us from self and Satan, the internal and external fiend. The Lord forbid we should fall into the snare of the Sadducees, with the former of these two famous men; or into that of the Pharisees, with the latter.

As his health improved gradually, Fletcher was able to preach from time to time in the Protestant chapels of his native place, Nyon. He was not impressed by the depth of the religion of the district. "The inhabitants," he says, "are chiefly woodmen, coopers, watchmakers, and jewellers. They told me they had the best singing and the best preacher in the country. I asked if any sinners were converted under his ministry? They stared, and asked what I meant by conversion? When I had explained myself, they said: 'We do not live in the time of miracles.'"

In one village, however, he found a Mission being conducted by three preachers, who drew large congregations and greatly affected their hearers. He himself was allowed to preach in a gaol-yard to two thousand people who had come to see a murderer two days before his execution. Fletcher was abused by the Bailiff for his sermon, and was not granted the permission, which he sought, to attend the poor wretch to the scaffold, where he was to be broken on the wheel.

The authorities, thinking him a dangerous sectary expelled from England, further forbade his ministrations in Switzerland; and Fletcher's evangelistic spirit had to be content with preaching and praying with the village children, or any who in the surrounding villages would join him in simple improvised services in the open.

Meanwhile Fletcher's health was continually improving, and in 1781 he was able to return to England and resume his pastoral work at Madeley, where during his long illness he had kept a curate, maintaining a personal connection with his parishioners by occasional earnest and affectionate pastoral letters.

V.

Strangely enough, he was not destined to live long after this, though his health seemed so thoroughly restored. But before we glance at the last chapter of his life and work at Madeley, it may be appropriate to look more closely at Fletcher's character, which was, already in his lifetime, recognized as one of deep holiness.

Personal love for our Lord leads saints, in different ways, to the same essentials. Thus the Curé d'Ars (of whom one is often reminded

in reading of Fletcher) would spend long time alone in church in adoration before the Reserved Sacrament, and was never tired of telling his people the love of the Saviour who was all in all to him. And we find the eighteenth-century Evangelical writing thus: "Steal from business now and then, though for three or four minutes only, and in the corner where you can be least observed pour out your soul in confession, or a short ejaculation, at the feet of Jesus, for power to watch and to believe that He can keep you watching."

Fletcher, like Newton, was never tired of writing to correspondents of the personal love of Jesus, and of the devoted loyalty due to Him from His redeemed.

Intense love for his fellow-men prevented Fletcher, as it also prevented the Curé d'Ars, from showing personal resentment at any slight or injury, however great. Here his humility never seemed to fail him. It was characteristic of him that, if he ever felt obliged to enter controversy, he would seek personal interviews with his opponents to assure them of his friendship, and to beg their pardon if unwittingly he had ever hurt their feelings. "They may excommunicate me," he said once of strong Dissenters, "if their prejudice prompt them to it; they may build up a wall of partition between themselves and me, but 'in the strength of my God,' whose love is as boundless as His immensity, 'I will leap over the wall.'" And certainly human prejudice or pride seemed unable to rear any barrier which Fletcher's persistent love could not in time overleap.

Love, indeed, to God and man seemed to impregnate all his daily life, words, and acts. "O for universal, lasting kindness!" he writes. "This world to me is now become a world of love." This intense desire for charity led him continually to unexpected acts, and on one occasion to an amazing act which, whatever we may think of it, was actuated by pure feelings of unmitigated love. Whilst he was staying at a Bristol friend's house for the sake of his health, several pious men sought him out, and found him in the yard, just returned from a ride. Greeting them with affection, he spoke at some length, though exhausted by his ride, on part of the sixteenth chapter of St. John. One of the visitors thus describes what followed:

> After a little further conversation upon the universal love of God in Christ Jesus we were about to take our leave, when Mr. Ireland sent his footman into the yard with a bottle of red wine and some slices of bread upon a waiter; we all uncovered our heads, while Mr. Fletcher craved a blessing upon the same, which he had no sooner done, but he handed, first, the bread to each, and lifting up his eyes to heaven, pronounced these

words: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." Afterwards, handing the wine, he repeated in like manner, "The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," etc. But such a sacrament I never had before. A sense of the Divine Presence rested upon us all, and we were melted into floods of tears. His worthy friend, Mr. Ireland, grieved to see him exhaust his little strength by so much speaking, took him by the arm, and almost forced him into the house, while he kept looking wistfully, and speaking to us as long as we could see him.

Everything in the life of this extraordinary man was begun, continued, and ended in prayer. Without it he considered no plan, entered upon no duty, neither read, conversed, visited, or received a visitor. One who was afterwards a friend has left an account of the loving welcome he received at his first visit as an entire stranger, and how his host, on his arrival, asked him, before anything else was done or spoken, to kneel with him in prayer for a blessing on his visit. And not less noticeable was the strain of unceasing praise and thanksgiving which permeated Fletcher's daily life. Nothing in the way of illness or persecution or difficulties could check the constant flow of praise and thankfulness which he felt, and continually expressed, even in ordinary conversation, for the goodness of God.

VI.

We now come to the last phase in Fletcher's life. Returning from Switzerland to his parish in 1781, he felt sufficiently restored in health to marry a Miss Bosanquet, whom he had known for many years, and who was ideally suited to him in her outlook and spirituality. He had thought of her as a possible helpmate twenty-five years before, but ill-health and other reasons had intervened.

He found on his return that Madeley had considerably relapsed from the improved condition in which he left it four years before. Writing to a friend at this time, he says: "Pray, what news of the glory? Does the glory of the Lord fill the temple, your house, your heart? A cloud is over my poor parish; but, alas! it is not the luminous cloud by day, nor the pillar of fire by night. Even the few remaining professors stared at me the other day when I preached to them on these words: 'Ye shall receive the Holy Ghost; for the promise is unto you.' Well, the promise is unto *us*; if others despise it, let us still believe and hope. Nothing enlarges the heart and awakens the soul more than that believing, loving expectation. Let us wait together until we are all endued with power from on high." Gradually, however, the results of his earnest and unstinted

labours began to be apparent, and a general reformation of the parish was effected.

In the summer of 1785, a few weeks before his death, Fletcher felt a strong presentiment that his end was near. On Thursday, August 4, he was out in his parish from three until nine in the evening. On coming home he said that he had caught cold, and he stayed indoors on Friday and Saturday. On Saturday night he had a high fever, and his wife besought him not to take the next day's services. He declared, however, that it was God's will that he should do so; and even though a priest was staying in the house and was anxious to relieve him of them, Fletcher persisted, and the next morning began the service. Before long his countenance changed and his voice faltered, and from time to time he was obviously near to fainting. His wife begged him to discontinue; but he persisted, and even preached with some vigour upon the mercy of God. His congregation were distressed at his obvious suffering; but when the sermon was over, he walked up to the altar, saying: "I am going to throw myself under the wings of the cherubim, before the mercy-seat." Our narrative may now follow Mrs. Fletcher's description of the scene:

> The people were deeply affected while they beheld him offering up the last languid remains of a life that had been lavishly spent in their service. Groans and tears were on every side. In going through this last part of his duty he was exhausted again and again; but his spiritual vigour triumphed over his bodily weakness. After several times sinking on the sacramental table he still resumed his sacred work, and cheerfully distributed with his dying hand the love memorials of his dying Lord. In the course of this concluding office, which he performed by means of the most astonishing exertions, he gave out several verses of hymns, and delivered many affectionate exhortations to his people, calling upon them, at intervals, to celebrate the mercy of God in short songs of adoration and praise. And now, having struggled through a service of near four hours' continuance, he was supported, with blessings in his mouth, from the altar to his chamber, where he lay for some time in a swoon, and from whence he never walked into the world again.

When he awoke, it was to cry to his wife with a pleasant smile: "Now, my dear, thou seest I am no worse for doing the Lord's work. He never fails me, when I trust in Him."

For a week he lingered, dozing and waking again to praise God. "I want," he said to his wife, "a great gust of praise to go to the ends of the earth!" When his speech did not fail him, as it often

did, he was continually urging his wife and their servant to sing the praises of God. At last, on Sunday evening, he passed peacefully away. Wesley, who had wished him to succeed him as leader of the Methodist societies, was to survive him for several years.

This is not the place to estimate John Fletcher's place or value in the Church. There have been very few to whom their own generation has agreed to ascribe great saintliness; but he was one of them. "Sir," said Mr. Venn, when asked his opinion of Fletcher, "he was a *luminary*. A luminary, did I say?—he was a sun! I have known all the great men for these fifty years, but none like him!" To this John Wesley added his memorable witness: "Many exemplary men have I known, holy in heart and life, within fourscore years, but one equal to him have I never known, one so inwardly and outwardly devoted to God." It is no small testimony to the divine vitality of the Church that in an age when her candle was burning very low in its socket and her witness was feeble in the extreme, she yet could produce priests like Wesley and Whitefield, and one who lived so close to his Master as John William Fletcher.

G. Lacey May.

BANCROFT AND THE DIVINE RIGHT OF BISHOPS

The doctrine of the Divine Right of Bishops has played so considerable a part in English ecclesiastical history during the last three centuries that a good deal of stress has been laid upon its supposed origin and upon its originator. It has usually been said* that the idea was first explicitly stated at length by Richard Bancroft in his sermon at St. Paul's Cross, February 9, 1588-89; that the sermon was preached to denounce the doctrine, which might therefore be presumed to have met the approval of Whitgift, the Archbishop, if not of Elizabeth. Indeed, a story has gone the rounds of the memoir compilers to the effect that the Archbishop was once told by an officious Puritan that Dr. Bancroft had declared Episcopacy a divine institution, and, instead of exhibiting the wrath which the

* Strype, *Life of Whitgift*, i., 559; John Hunt, *Religious Thought in England*, i., 86 (London, 1870); Keble's Preface to Hooker's *Works*, 7th edition, I., lxxiii.; Dr. Gardiner (*History of England*, i., 40) couples Bancroft and Laud as if they agreed on this point, and makes Bancroft a follower of Hooker instead of his predecessor. See Usher, *Reconstruction of the English Church*, i., 71-76, on the relation of Bancroft, Whitgift, and Hooker; W. H. Frere, *A History of the English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James*, i., 273 (London, 1904). Hallam alone doubts the clarity of the statements in Bancroft's Sermon, *Constitutional History*, London, 1850 (2 vols.), i., 395, 396 *note*.

Puritan hoped to witness, he replied that it ought to be true, and he wished it were. Naturally, whether or not Bancroft in this particular sermon espoused the theory is not a matter whose decision one way or the other would influence the theological controversy concerning the doctrine's validity; but if he did not pronounce Episcopacy a divine institution, the beginning of the belief in the doctrine by the leaders of the English Church will have been antedated, and the theological views of a numerous and exceedingly important group of men will have been much misunderstood. The elucidation of this apparently slight incident may thus produce results more than commensurate with the extent of the inquiry, for the ascription of the doctrine to Bancroft, and, indeed, the notion that it began to be current about 1588, rests entirely on this sermon and the *a priori* arguments based upon its supposed contents.

But when in sober earnest we read the printed sermon* on which this claim is based, it transpires that nothing is said in those hundred odd pages about the Divine Right of Bishops. The phrase itself does not occur, the idea appears neither explicitly nor as a necessary conclusion from the arguments advanced, and it is, in addition, perfectly evident that the sermon was delivered with a different purpose. Bancroft had set himself the task of discrediting the Puritans, their theories and practices, and had no intention of establishing a new theological tenet. He stoutly denied the Divine Origin of the Presbytery, but he did not declare the Divine Right of Bishops. Indeed, a long and careful search in the literature which grew out of the sermon, as well as in the general theological writing of the period, has as yet revealed but a single instance of the use of the phrase, *jure divino*, and no case of the employment of the English, "The Divine Right of Bishops"; and it is doubtful whether anyone held that theory in all its completeness until some years after Bancroft's death.

The idea that Bancroft had proclaimed the theory started with certain charges made against him by some of the Puritan leaders immediately after the publication of the sermon.† The sermon was an exceedingly powerful philippic against the Puritans, and, in particular, brought into prominence their new scheme of Church discipline proposing the substitution of Presbyteries for Bishops. It was by no means the first sermon or tract on the subject, but it was by far the most effective, and the Puritan leaders eagerly sought

* It was licensed for publication March 3, 1588-89, and several editions appeared during that and following five years. The editions of 1589 are so rare, however, that the references in this article are given to the careful reprint in Hickes, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*.

† An account of the circumstances under which the sermon was written and of its results is in Usher, *Reconstruction of the English Church*, i., chap. iii.

some means of undermining Bancroft's growing reputation with the people and with the Court as a consequence of the sermon's success. If they could sap the popular belief in his truthfulness, they might perhaps re-establish themselves in popular esteem.

From some words dropped by Knollys in his speech in Parliament, it seems probable that the Puritans made much of a quarrel between Gardiner and Henry VIII. in 1535 over the effect of the doctrine of the royal supremacy upon the Apostolic Succession. The King had very much objected to the Bishop's contention that the Bishops received their power from God and not from the King. "If it be God's authority, to us allotted," wrote Gardiner, "tho we cannot use it condignely, yet we cannot giue it away."* Whether from knowledge of this incident or not, Knollys, Raignolds, and Cartwright decided to accuse Bancroft of the elastic and dreaded crime of denying the royal supremacy. which, if proven, would be at the least misprision of treason. Sir Francis Knollys, the Queen's cousin and the Treasurer of the Household, a power at Court and a strong Puritan, sent to Burghley on May 22, or 23, 1589, a Dr. Hammond, who verbally brought the charge. Apparently, Burghley insisted on receiving a direct statement to that effect from Knollys, for the latter sent him a day or two later (May 24) an explicit written statement and a copy of his instructions to Dr. Hammond.† Burghley then wrote in June to Raignolds,‡ who was well known as a scholar at Oxford and who was not yet known to be a Puritan, and asked him to send him his opinion on the matter. Raignolds, who had already been prepared by Knollys for the question, replied at length in September, supporting the proposition.§ In all probability Cartwright was also consulted. Knollys even went so far as to make a speech in Parliament in June.‖ The whole correspondence seems then to have been submitted to Bancroft, who satisfied the Queen, Burghley, and everyone concerned (except the Puritans) that the accusation was groundless.¶ Yet this charge,

* Strype, *Memorials*, I., i., 332; I., ii., 220.

† *Royal Historical MSS. Com. Calendar of the Hatfield MSS.*, iii, 412 ff., prints accurate abstracts of the whole correspondence.

‡ This letter is apparently lost.

§ *Lansdowne MSS.*, 61, No. 27, September 19, 1589. Holograph.

‖ This speech and a letter to Burghley, in which he reiterated what he had said, became stock campaign documents of the Puritans. We now have only the reprints: one in London in 1604, at the end of Stoughton's *Assertion for True and Christian Church Policie ;* and another in Edinburgh (?) in 1608, *Informations on a Protestation and a Treatise from Scotland, seconded with D. Reignolds his letter to Sir Francis Knollis, and Sir Francis Knollis his speach in Parliament, All suggesting the usurpation of Papal Bishops.*

¶ Bancroft's reply and the syllogisms are to be found only in Strype, *Whitgift*, i., 559-565.

thus made and thus emphatically rejected by the officials of Church and State, is the sole basis for the oft-repeated assertion that Richard Bancroft was the originator of the doctrine of the Divine Right of Bishops in 1589.

Knollys' instructions to Hammond commanded him to urge Burghley to make "her Majesty privy to the state of the controversy between the claim of the Bishops' superiority over their inferior clergy; that they do not claim it directly from her Majesty's grant, but they claim it as appertaining to their persons by God's own ordinance, as soon as her Majesty hath made them Bishops." This, he said, was contrary to the doctrine of the royal supremacy. In fact, the Bishops intended thus to render themselves independent of the Crown, and restore the same sort of a hierarchy as the Pope had so long maintained in England. Much danger would arise from "the loose bridle given to the ambitions and covetousness of our Bishops." Raignolds wrote to Burghley: "Of the two points, therefore, in D. Bancroft's sermon, which your honour [Burghley] mentioneth, one is concerning that he seemeth to avouch the superioritie which Bishops have amongst us over the clergie, to be of God's own ordinance: *though not by expresse words yet by necessarie consequence*, in that he affirmeth their opinion, who impugne that superioritie to be heresie. Wherein I must confesse that he hath committed an error in my judgement; and himselfe, I think, if he be advertised thereof, will acknowledge. For having said, first that Aerius affirmed that there was no difference by the Word of God betwixt a priest and a Bishop: and afterward, that Martin Marprelate and his companions doe maintaine this opinione of Aerius: he addeth that Aerius persisting therein was condemned for a hereticke by the generall consent of the whole church: and that likewise Martin's and all his companions' opinions hath herein bene condemned for an heresie. . . . He doth deprave the impugners of it as holding with Aerius that there is no difference by the Word of God betwixt a priest and a bishop, which he could not do with reason unlesse himselfe approved the Bishops' superioritie, as established by God's Word."

The passage of Bancroft's sermon referred to is as follows: "For it appeareth in Epiphanius, after due trial and Examination made by the Learned Fathers who then lived, of all his [Aerius's] Arguments and Slights which he used for the Proof of his Assertions, that with a general Consent of the whole Church, his Opinions were overthrown, and he himself persisting in them was condemned for an Heretick. Saint Augustine likewise beareth witness hereof, who in his Book of Heresies, ascribeth this to Aerius for one, in that he said, Presbyterum ab Episcopo nulla differentia debere discerni (cap. 53)."* This, then, was the argument: Bancroft had quoted

* Hickes, *Bibliotheca*, 259; Strype, *Whitgift*, i., 559.

Aerius's opinion that there was no difference in Scripture between a priest and a Bishop, and had declared that the Puritans held precisely the same views. But inasmuch as Aerius was one of the most noted heretics in ecclesiastical history, the Puritans must also be heretics; and, since heresy can exist only where there is a precise and direct denial of the heavenly commands, therefore the superiority of Bishops over the clergy must be by "God's own Ordinance." Even Raignolds does not use the phrase "Divine Right"; even he goes no further than to maintain that the theory follows as a logical deduction from something else Bancroft said. Attention, moreover, was drawn to this "logical" conclusion from Bancroft's words, not because the Government was thought to approve of it, but because the Puritans hoped that the State would vent an active displeasure upon the author of such sentiments: not only because the idea troubled their consciences, but because they hoped it would injure the Bishops.

There are in the sermon certain phrases which are interesting in this connection, and may be said to include every utterance in that document which might bear upon this point. "Bishops have had this authority which Martin condemneth ever since the Evangelist St. Mark's time. Besides, in the most flourishing time of the Church that ever happened since the Apostles Days, either in respect of Learning or of Zeal, Martin's and all his Companions Opinion hath herein been condemned for an Heresy. Lastly, there is no man living, as I suppose, able to shew that there was any church planted ever since the Apostles times, but there the Bishops had Authority over the rest of the Ministry."* "The Church of God ever since the Apostles Times hath distributed the Ecclesiastical Ministry principally into these three parts, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, according as it is contained in the Apology of the Church of England."† "The government thereof [*i.e.*, of the Church] both in respect of Her Majesty and of our Bishops, is lawful and godly." The Bishops are "Through the Proud Presumption of certain, contempned, and *being men by God's* approbation allowed and honoured, are of unworthy men judged." "It is manifest by the History of those and the former Times, that . . . Bishops had authority given them over the rest of the Clergy.‡ Eusebius meaneth nothing else in that place but to signify the great appearance from all Places of the Clergymen of all sorts in that most honorable Synod, [of Nice] . . . long before that time, Bishops had very large Jurisdictions."§

* Hickes, p. 291. † *Ibid.*, p. 310.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 256-57. The part in italics is quoted from Cyprian, *Ad Pupianum.*

§ *Ibid.*, p. 312

All arguments in favour of the Divine Right of Bishops which might be twisted from these phrases are completely refuted by Bancroft's description of the rise of Bishops in the early Church, and his complete recognition of the fact that force of circumstances and not Divine Right was its cause. "Nay, it is manifest, by the History of those and the former Times, that *as at first for the repressing of Schisms*, Bishops had Authority given them over the rest of the Clergy, *so upon good experience and long proof*, that the Bishops being many in number, did grow themselves likewise at some Jarrs; it seemed good unto that Council with the Emperors consent for the better Government of them in like manner to divide the whole Body of Christendom into four Patriarchships."* The Patriarchships were founded upon the same considerations of "good Experience and long Proof" which had led to the establishment of the Bishops themselves.

A syllogism, which Strype gives as one submitted to Bancroft with the correspondence, and to which an answer was requested, contains the only use of the phrase "*jure divino*."† "The preacher upon Sunday the 12th of January, 1588,‡ maintained, that the Bishops of this realm had superiority over the inferior Clergy, otherwise than by and from Her Majesty's authority, namely, *jure divino*." Bancroft's reply is found only in Strype. He declared the phrases of the syllogism captious, "the cavil being hidden in the word *otherwise*." Understood as the Puritans clearly intended they should be, "I never avouched any such thing: which had been clean contrary to the chief scope of my sermon and against all mine own writings." And, he retorted, "those who declare the Presbytery to be *jure divino*, which is clearly contrary to Her Majesty's laws, do much more injure Her Majesty's supremacy than I." The Puritans were unwilling to leave the matter here, and produced a

* Hickes, p. 312. † Strype, *Whitgift*, i., 559-565.

‡ This is certainly an error for February 9, 1588-89. There would seem to be no excuse for the blunder, for the title of every edition of the printed sermon gives the date, and the correspondence leaves no doubt of its correctness. The title also says distinctly that the sermon was preached at Paul's Cross, but Strype says he does not know where it was preached, and hazards St. Paul's as a conjecture. He also gives the impression that Bancroft was at this time the author of tracts which were not in fact written or printed till five years later. He calls Bancroft Whitgift's Chaplain, although the title of the sermon explicitly calls him the Chaplain to the Lord Chancellor (Hatton). He says that Knollys wrote a letter to Raignolds, and then proceeds to quote, as nearly verbatim as he quotes anything, *from Raignolds' letter to Burghley*, of which we have the original. It seems highly improbable that a man of Raignolds' eminence should have merely copied something sent him by Knollys. It is regrettable that we must quote at all from an account which has been obviously so carelessly compiled

lengthy answer to Bancroft's defence, but the truth of the matter and the animus of the Puritans and of Knollys was by this time too clear to cause further alarm at Westminster or at Lambeth.

The not unimportant conclusion, however, is that, until more explicit proof can be adduced, this famous doctrine must have originated at a later time. Not only were the words *jure divino*, or Divine Right of Bishops, not commonly used, but the original documents do not employ them at all, and we find them only in Strype, whose statements, which we can check in this matter, are so lamentably inaccurate as to lend colour to the suggestion that he has read something into the original syllogism and Bancroft's reply. Literally all that the Puritans allege is that "he seemeth to avouch the superioritie which Bishops have amongst us over the clergie, to be of God's own ordinance." The fuller statements in the sermon make clear that Bancroft meant merely that, inasmuch as Episcopacy was not contrary to the Scriptures, it therefore possessed the approbation of God; that its rise, where expedient, would conform with the directions which God had given men to follow. A Puritan statement of 1627 charges Bishop Niele with the claim that "he was made bishop by our Lord Jesus Christ and consecrated by the Holy Ghost."* The difference between the two is obvious. In fact, it would be hard to find a Churchman of any degree who could believe in Episcopacy at all and not believe that it possessed the approbation of God. Far from having been the first to state the doctrine of the Divine Right of Bishops, there is plenty of direct evidence to show that Bancroft held a view nearly as much the antithesis of it as a Churchman could.

ROLAND G. USHER.

* Smart, *Short Treatise of Altars.*

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The inauguration of this journal coincides with a significant moment in the life and thought of the Christian Church. The heritage of our Communion, at once national and supra-national, marked it out for a pre-eminent share in the task of sustaining those ideals which alone saved whatever could be saved from the spiritual havoc of war; and it is safe to say that without her clear and distinctive witness in the world during the years which lie before us the hopes and aspirations centred in the League of Nations cannot be expected to mature. For that witness to be effective, it is not enough that principles should be proclaimed: they must be lived. Their sanction must be that of experience vindicating faith, and the prophetic Word be seen to have been "made flesh," if it is to commend to the nations the happy yoke of Christ's Sovereignty and the liberating energies of His Spirit. The function of theology is to demonstrate this, and to apply it.

"In Divinity," says Sir Thomas Browne, "I love to keep the road; and, though not in an implicit, yet an humble faith, follow the great wheel of the Church, by which I move." Divinity has changed its orientation in the last few years. Sorrow, disillusionment, and insecurity have recalled it from many a blind alley and tempting bye-road to consider afresh the first interests of the Christian faith. The optimism of the Edwardian and early Georgian age is confessed to be no substitute for religion; and the choice is now not so much between religion and agnosticism as between rival systems of thought, all alike aspiring to provide a spiritual basis for life. In this conflict of beliefs, Christianity has once more to define its nature and its claim; and, as in the first ages of the Church, to show by its consistent witness, its reasonable evidences, and its powers of absorbing all that is true in the society around it, that Jesus Christ is indeed the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

The sub-title of this journal implies a distinctive attitude to both the past and the present of Christianity. We may adumbrate it by saying that the Christian Revelation presupposes a community of believers, to which and through which the truth is disclosed, the Word of God spoken, and His mercies offered for appropriation. Scripture is the record of this community, originally tribal, then national, finally universal. The New Testament is the normative expression of the community-experience; but it is not its only expression. Indeed the "appeal to Scripture" itself implies a parallel appeal; for Scripture was not always as we have it to-day. It is the result of the selective instinct of the community; and a peculiar authority, proportional though not equal to that of Scripture, attaches to the age of the Fathers, during which the limits of the Canon were fixed.

The tradition of Anglican theology has been to define the appellate jurisdiction of antiquity somewhat strictly, restricting it to the first four or the first six or even the first eleven centuries. Such a closure has served useful controversial purposes; but it is hardly scientific. For Christianity has continued as a force of portentous moment down to our own day, the one life manifesting itself in ever new forms—many of them none the less new because they were claimed as old. On the one hand, advancing knowledge and widening experience have profoundly affected the interpretation of Scripture; so that, though the formative process of the first

ages cannot recur, the scarcely less creative work of criticizing and re-setting the main lines of its exegesis is never finished. For such a task faith must have a rational and coherent framework; and, while Catholic theology has often been too slow to pass from the old to the new, the failure of Protestant thought has lain in often appropriating the new at the expense of all homogeneity whatever. The latter error is the less easily remediable.

On the other hand, again, religion, just because it is a communal affair, must be studied in close relation with the sociological grouping which makes its environment. Scholasticism is as unthinkable without the background of the Church-Empire as it would be without Aristotle. The Renaissance introduced a new European grouping, in which the nations struggled to birth and the Church-State took the place of the Church-Empire. To-day nationalism itself is being superseded; and we witness the adaptation of the Christian community to a League of Nations on the one hand and a more functional organization of civic life on the other. Here, too, both Latin Catholicism and Protestantism are behindhand in their adjustments; the first through adhesion to an internationalism which has rarely given more than a grudging recognition to the principles of national freedom, the second through an obstinate blindness to the significance of all forms of Christianity except those of Anglo-Saxon or Teutonic mould. On both scores Anglican theology, too, must admit its share of guilt; but at least its close and constant association with public life, its reverent fearlessness, its wide and sympathetic learning, qualify it to play a great part in the understanding of historic Christianity.

The various gatherings now assembling will afford ample material for reflection during the coming months. The meeting of the Lambeth Conference wakes again the honoured memory of some who were its giants twelve years ago. The wide learning of John Sarum and the joyful holiness of Bishop King; the commanding eloquence and statesmanlike vision of Bishop Lefroy and of the then Bishop of Rhode Island; the unfailing gift of just and balanced expression which was the peculiar contribution of Bishop Paget—these things will be difficult to replace.* Yet "the great wheel of the Church" moves on; and we do not doubt that the same Spirit will preside over the handling of the new problems now presented. We hope to publish reviews of the various groups of resolutions during the autumn and winter; and meanwhile the initial articles of our first three numbers, setting forth the credentials of our Communion, will direct attention to those principles which, whether or not they are expressly reiterated, give to the Conference its peculiar authority.

If the perusal of ecclesiastical history be, as Bishop Lightfoot once said, a "cordial for drooping spirits," the record of *The Five Lambeth Conferences*, compiled by Miss Honor Thomas under the direction of the Primate, should not fail of readers. A different interest attaches to two other notable gatherings which immediately precede that at Lambeth; for their history lies before them. The Anglo-Catholic Congress has its counterpart, no doubt, in the celebrated evangelical meetings associated with Islington or Keswick. But in itself it is an experiment, and an ambitious one. While the agenda of the Bishops is mainly administrative, that of the Congress is mainly theological; and the names of the readers of papers guarantee a high level of scholarship and thought. The strength of the Catholic movement has lain in so combining teaching with worship

* The venerated name of Handley Moule, Bishop of Durham, must be added to the above, as we go to press.

as to make theology a live thing for ordinary people; and the paradox of a theological gathering which is at once scientific and popular is seen on nearer inspection to be the product of familiar causes.

But of this, as of the National Assembly of the Church of England, it is too early yet to speak. The latter at least has come to stay, and we may expect that it will fulfil an increasingly valuable function in the development of English religion. The questions which come before it, its debates, and its decisions will no doubt be often alluded to in our pages.

This journal shares with the two gatherings just mentioned the privilege (if such it be) of being an experiment. We believe that a monthly periodical really representative of the life and thought of our Communion has been much needed: it remains to be seen whether we can meet the need. Gratitude is due to many who have already helped us in different ways—to correspondents in the United States, Canada, India, Australia, South Africa, and elsewhere, who have promised to act as "remembrancers" when occasion offers; to many publishers, who have sent books for review; to proprietors of other theological journals, who have kindly consented to exchange their copies with ours; and to those who have contributed articles and reviews. May we claim at the outset the liberty accorded to all growing things—the liberty to outgrow their clothes? We interpret the Catholic principles of our Communion as directly inculcating a catholic, if discriminating, sympathy with every genuine movement of man's spirit—in literature, art, and music, as well as in religion and scientific study; and the sole limitations we wish to put upon the Terentian motto, *Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto*, are dictated by considerations of emphasis and of space. We will only say here that, whatever variety of form and method we may present, we shall seek to bear in mind one single and undeviating purpose—that of furthering our Saviour's promise: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

RECENT ARTICLES OF INTEREST*

1. Philosophical.

"Personality in Recent Philosophy" (Dean of Carlisle). *Church Quarterly Review*, April, 1920.

"De Deo prima causa efficiente, exemplari, et finali universi" (Cardinal L. Billot). *Gregorianum*, January, 1920.

2. Biblical.

"The Silence of St. Paul" (Right Hon. Lord Sands). *Expositor*, April, 1920.

3. Psychology.

"Mind and Medicine" (Dr. W. H. R. Rivers, F.R.S.). *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, April to November, 1919.

4. Contemporary.

"Prospects of Union between the Eastern and Anglican Churches" (Dr. Sparrow Simpson). *Christian East*, March, 1920.

"Movements towards Church Union." *International Review of Missions*, January, 1920.

* A brief record of matter in recent periodicals which, by virtue of its positive contribution to knowledge and thought, or its bearing upon subjects treated of in Theology, may be of use to our readers.

"IN THE SPIRIT"

Dominus Illuminatio.

PSALM lxxiii. 23.

THE highest spiritual experience to which we can aspire is the union of the soul with God. Precisely what is involved in that experience is past telling, although saints and mystics have written about it. The truth is that it is incommunicable. They agree that what is communicated to the soul in advanced states of mystic grace is of an order to which human language is not adapted. But although their secret might not be disclosed, they have unerringly guided others to a like attainment, and it is ours to know and pursue for ourselves. The whole work is that of love. That which the soul finds is the ultimate content of love. But this is not possible in any state short of union. There are partial visions of love's glory, fleeting intuitions of unearthly possibilities of love which are given for our encouragement; and we should attend to them with all seriousness, for they disclose the nature of the love which is to elevate the soul to the degree of union. That love must be strong, vehement, and above all pure. There must be no truce with self-love in the soul that aspires to union with its Lord in love. Rather must there be a continual dying to the self, and that not merely by acts of self-affliction, by which passions and likings are subdued and mortified, but rather by those stronger actions of love by which the soul goes forth from its state of self-liking, forsaking its former ways, and responding with all its powers to the Divine discipline of love. God Himself directs the aspiring soul and trains it in hard ways until its love is pure. The wise soul will not account itself to have attained anything while the need of discipline continues, but will desire the secret counsels of the Holy Spirit, knowing that in humility and obedience there is safety, though it travel in darkness. The glory of consummated love awaits the soul in the kingdom of its Lord. "Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, and after that receive me with glory."

X.

The Word in Action.

Loyalty.

"Though I must die with Thee, I will not deny Thee."—MARK xiv. 31.

A.—*Loyalty*, a sense of obligation, the crying need now, in a period of reaction from D.O.R.A., etc. German methods abroad and the spy fever at home produced suspicion and unity—two opposite conditions; and now that official unity is at an end we are left with suspicion in faith, in politics, in society.

So St. Peter, after the strain of Holy Week and Gethsemane, removed from the unifying presence of Jesus Christ, trembling with fear and cold without in the court, forgot all the old obligations and denied Him thrice, disloyal to the Son of God as Apostle, to the Son of David as Jew, to the Son of man as friend.

The temptation to be disloyal is none the less severe now when the appeal is to pride rather than fear. The *loyal* temper is that which cannot be either dissuaded or frightened from the duty to which it is understood to be committed.

B. *Loyalty to God—*

(*a*) In the broadest sense: loyalty to the absent King; the martyr spirit. Jehovah or Baal? Diana or Christ? "Whosoever shall be ashamed of Me and of My words in this adulterous and sinful generation . . ." (Mark viii. 38), adultery being a particularly apt illustration, from the prophets onwards, of disloyalty to the only true God, Christ and "His spouse the Church." Further, to be in the pay of both sides is worse than to desert completely to the enemy; but in the spiritual war it is often attempted. Nevertheless, "Thou shalt have none other gods *beside* Me," and "No man can serve two masters." This rules out the Hindoo pantheon of to-day or the mixed cults of ancient Rome. Such religious systems are the types of compromise with sin.

(*b*) Special senses:

1. *Loyalty to "Church."*—Not every move towards religious unity is of God, albeit His Son's last prayer was that Christians might "all be one" [John xvii. 21]. Loyalty to ecclesiastical authority is not the less valuable because there is no statute *De heretico comburendo* to enforce it. St. Paul, the Apostle of faith and liberty, was in his turn vexed with antinomianism; so a reformed Church must expect trouble from exaggeration of its own principles. Anyhow—

> N.B.—(1) Over-inclusion defeats its own object; (2) on the other hand, there is a Catholic ideal which demands loyalty and patience of all Christian peoples. Nationality is a means, not the end; witness the history of Israel written in the Old Testament "for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the ages are come" (1 Cor. x. 11). Is there here a conflict of loyalties?

2. *Loyalty to the Parson.*—He is *persona ecclesiæ* in the eyes of the law—nay, when all is said and done (cp. Article XXVI., "Of the unworthiness of the ministers"), he is the representative of Christ Himself (John xiii. 20). Will it be all the incumbent's fault, for instance, if the new Parochial Church meeting becomes the battleground of parochial factions? In the ministry itself there is a subtle temptation to disloyalty by way of the very personal gifts which (like national virtues, *supra*) are entrusted for the winning of souls for the Master, as a means and not the end; and so the work of a "curate" is tested by the years which follow his departure. But allowing for (say) an outgoing Vicar's responsibility in having intruded himself between God and His people, the so-called faithful laity sometimes assume too readily that an uncongenial pastor has no claim upon their co-operation. They admit that he is incomplete without them, but dislike the idea of being themselves incomplete without him—as though they were not all "fellow-workers with Christ"! Did any of St. Paul's Roman Christians throw over the Gospel because their names were not mentioned in chapter xvi.? Perhaps.

C.—The recurring truth which it is hoped to illustrate from successive points of view is that men's loyalty to God is inseparable from their loyalty to one another. It was a bad sign, a significant shadow of the approaching failure, "when they all forsook Him and fled," that dispute among themselves which should be the greatest. Why is the story of the Crusades such sad reading? It was the same taint in all ranks of those who wore the crimson cross: pillage in Hungary, Bulgaria, and Constantinople, under Walter the Penniless, and even Peter the Hermit; princely feuds and jealousies between Tancred and Raymond in the first Crusade, or Philip and Richard in the third. In 1099 the Cross floated over Jerusalem; in 1453 the Crescent was planted in Constantinople.

Y.

REVIEWS

God and Personality (Gifford Lectures delivered in the University of Aberdeen, 1918-19. First Course). By Clement C. J. Webb.* London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. Pp. 281. 10s. 6d. net.

Readers acquainted with Mr. Webb's earlier volumes will probably come to these Gifford Lectures with high expectations, and the book is not likely to disappoint them. It deals with its high theme in a manner marked both by great learning and by real philosophical acumen. There are perhaps some important points on which one would like to know Mr. Webb's judgment rather more fully before one would care to say how far he has presented us with a doctrine of Divine personality which does full justice both to the demands of religion and to those of a thoroughly rational philosophy. This is notably the case with regard to the insistent problem of human immortality, on which Mr. Webb seems to speak with great reserve, if not with an uncertain voice. But it has to be remembered that what we have before us is only the first half of a complete work. Mr. Webb has reasons of his own for discussing personality in God before approaching the study of personality in man. But it is only, of course, when both problems have been treated that we shall be able to understand fully the whole of Mr. Webb's view of either Divine or human personality, and we shall not judge the present volume fairly unless we are careful to bear in mind that it requires completion and supplementation by the issue of the second half of the author's Aberdeen Lectures.

Mr. Webb's own philosophical position is a highly interesting one. In the main his master in metaphysics is Mr. Bradley, but what he gives us is the metaphysical doctrine of Mr. Bradley as understood by a trained theologian, who is also a professing and practising Christian with a profound sense of the importance of the historical and institutional elements in religion. He is, I think, quite successful in showing how completely the most fundamental theses of Mr. Bradley's philosophy are compatible, to say the least of it, with a definitely Christian theism. This is important, since a certain impatience with crude popular presentations of Christian doctrines, which no careful theologian would admit as orthodox, has caused Mr. Bradley's own utterances to be understood in many quarters in an anti-theistic sense which they will hardly bear on an impartial construction. In fact, if I may say such a thing without intending to be in any way flippant or disrespectful, Mr. Bradley himself seems too often to write as though the ultimate

* [We hope to publish Professor Taylor's review of the Second Course of Professor Webb's Gifford Lectures in September or October.—Ed.]

seat of authoritative interpretation of Christian dogma were the pulpit of a fervent, but theologically uneducated, Evangelical preacher. This makes it easy for a philosophical opponent, such as the Dean of Carlisle, to maintain, no doubt with the fullest conviction, that the philosophy of Mr. Bradley and the Christian religion are in irreconcilable antagonism. I do not believe this to be Mr. Bradley's own view, and it is certainly not mine. I should, indeed, agree with the general conviction that one notorious metaphysical doctrine of Mr. Bradley's, his theory that no proposition asserting a relation can be "ultimately true," is fatal to Christian theology, as it seems to be fatal to everything else. But this doctrine can, I believe, be denied without affecting the main value of Mr. Bradley's contribution to philosophical thought. Even if we regard it as a dangerous philosophical error, it is an error which Mr. Bradley shares with the very greatest of the Christian mystics. Hence in the ultimate things it has always seemed to me that Mr. Bradley is in many ways more at one with the great body of Christian saints and doctors than the Dean of Carlisle himself, whose theology always reminds me a little unpleasantly of the deists of the eighteenth century, at least in all that part of it which deals directly with the nature of God. If Mr. Bradley seems at times to be a direct descendant of the mystics who virtually abolished all positive theology, I cannot help feeling that Dr. Rashdall is blind to the real and permanent significance of the negative way.

If it is Mr. Bradley who is plainly, of all our living philosophers, the one most after Mr. Webb's heart, he has also much to say about two other thinkers who have exercised a profound influence on the generation to which both he and I belong, Professor Bosanquet and Lotze. Indeed he, in a way, takes the point of departure for the whole of these Lectures from a well-known difference between these two thinkers. Lotze, who refuses to call his Supreme Being an "individual," emphatically insists that the Supreme is a person, and, in fact, that He is the only complete person; Dr. Bosanquet, who holds that the Absolute and the Absolute only is truly individual, is as nearly contemptuous as so urbane a writer can be of the very notion of Divine personality. The central problem of Mr. Webb's Lectures is precisely the issue raised by this disagreement. In my own judgment he is philosophically amply justified in deciding the controversy in favour of Lotze. His discussion of Dr. Bosanquet's position is a model of philosophical sobriety and courtesy, but it leads to the conclusion which could scarcely be avoided, that with every intention of recognizing the right of religion to exist, Bosanquet, in fact, politely bows all real religion out of the world. For, to put the matter with perhaps unphilosophical bluntness, religion means worshipping something with all one's mind and soul and

strength. And you cannot really worship Bosanquet's Absolute when your eyes have been opened to its real character any more than you could worship a "fortuitous concourse of atoms." You can only worship what is through and through good, and only that of which personality is the *essentia* is good. This brief and blunt way of putting the point which Mr. Webb develops cautiously and elaborately is, as I say, unphilosophical in form, but in substance it seems to me absolutely sound. And I would make two remarks as corollaries. It is this line of thought which justifies Christian theology in its conviction that the Trinity of "persons" in the Godhead must be, as the phrase is, "essential" and not merely "economic." Signs have not been wanting in modern times of the tendency to revert from the commonly accepted standards of orthodox belief to the conception of a merely "economic" Trinity. But philosophically the reversion is a mistake. To make the Divine "persons," as Mr. Webb happily puts it, *personæ* merely in the sense of "parties" to such diverse transactions as the creation, redemption, and government of the world, so that it is, after all, the same undifferentiated individual who appears alike as the Divine "party" in all transactions, is in the end to deny that personal love and personal understanding are more at best than mere accidents of the Divine nature.

My second corollary is that Mr. Webb has, in my opinion, a right sense of a fundamental difference of spirit between Mr. Bradley and Dr. Bosanquet. Mr. Bradley's religion may be a heterodox one, but he always writes like a man who has a religion and is very much indeed in earnest about it. Dr. Bosanquet never, like Mr. Bradley, falls foul of the Christian pulpit in heated language. But that is precisely because he has not a religion of his own, or, at any rate, not one which is a vital interest. Where Mr. Bradley speaks as one contending for a faith, Dr. Bosanquet speaks with the calm of a curious observer from the outside. The fiercest blows from Mr. Bradley are, after all, the wounds of a friend; even approval from Dr. Bosanquet has something of the tone in which we may fancy Caiaphas would have commended our Lord if He had confined Himself to controversy with the fanaticism of the Pharisees. The mere intellectual formulæ of the two philosophers are so much in accord that superficial critics usually overlook this marked difference in temper, and I am the more glad that Mr. Webb has very properly called attention to it. He does well, also, to comment courteously, but incisively, on the singular parallel which Dr. Bosanquet seems to be in the habit of drawing between himself and Dante—a parallel, one might say, if one thinks of the temperaments revealed by the works of the two writers, between ice and fire.

As is only natural, a great deal of the interest of Mr. Webb's volume is historical. He has to trace for us the early history of the words which were adopted in Greek and Latin respectively to denote the distinctions within the Divine nature, ὑπόστασις and *persona*, and most of his discussion centres round the famous definition of the latter term by Boëthius, *persona est naturæ rationabilis individua substantia*. At first sight one might be tempted to be a little impatient with all this ancient philosophy. Why, it might be asked, cannot we discuss the attribution of personality to God on its own merits without troubling ourselves about the history of Greek and Latin Neoplatonist terminology? Mr. Webb has an admirable answer, which is also his justification for giving ten lectures on personality in God before saying a word about human personality. Ancient philosophy ran its whole course from the Milesians to the last Neoplatonists without ever feeling the need of the category of personality. "Socrates is a person" is a sentence which it would be all but impossible to translate into Greek or Latin at all. The truth is that, as Mr. Webb says, our modern interest in personality as characteristic of man himself has very largely arisen out of the elaborate attempts of the early Church to arrive at satisfactory conceptions about the nature of Deity and the mode of union of the human and Divine in Christ. The theology has begotten a psychology, and the psychology is not itself intelligible if we forget the theological discussions in which it originated. Mr. Webb does not say, but I think he might have said, that it is precisely because Mr. Bradley begins with personality as a category of psychology that his treatment of personality both in man and in God strikes some of his sincerest admirers as perfunctory and not quite worthy of him. We find ourselves thrown back on the theology of the ages of creed-making when we mean to discuss personality for the same reasons for which we have to go back to Ionian cosmology in any serious discussion of "matter." Every philosophical concept is of the nature of an answer to a question, and we cannot estimate the worth of the answer until we understand the precise import of the question. To understand that is impossible unless we know something of the considerations which have led to its being asked. Philosophers have too long treated the problems which engaged the interest of the early Church too much in the spirit of Gibbon, as though they were idle speculations of no practical import to the life and practice of any man. As Mr. Webb is careful to point out, it was precisely their tremendous practical import which led to the concentration of interest on them. The starting-point for the whole development is the felt necessity of finding a rational theory of both Divine and human nature which will do justice to the practical relation to life revealed in the acts and words

of Christ. It makes all the difference in the world to each of us whether or not Christ's attitude to God and man is the right one. If it is the right one, it must be possible to express it in a doctrine which is satisfactory to the intellect. Or, at least, so much must be conceded by everyone except those extreme "pragmatists" and "anti-intellectualists" (if there really are any such persons) who are content to make an absolute separation between truth and practice, and to say that a rule of life is none the worse for being based on an absurdity. If you do not quite seriously hold with the legendary schoolboy that "faith is believing what you know ain't true," you must have a theological dogma of some kind, even if it is only the simple dogma of the atheist of the parks. The only alternative to a dogma, as I believe Mr. Chesterton once said, is a prejudice.

I am not competent to follow Mr. Webb everywhere in his account of the history of the words *ὑπόστασις* and *persona*. To deal with them satisfactorily one would have to be at home, as he is, in patristic and scholastic literature, and also to be at home, as he modestly confesses he is not, in the whole of Neoplatonism. I feel that the discussion of the word *ὑπόστασις* in particular is a little perfunctory. The word could hardly be treated satisfactorily without a very special knowledge of Neoplatonic terminology. This knowledge Mr. Webb disclaims, and it is indeed certain that the first prerequisite for it is the construction of something which does not as yet exist, a full and trustworthy *Index Græcitatis* to the *Enneads* of Plotinus. As it is, I am sure that Mr. Webb's account of the meanings of the all-important word is too simple for the facts. It is true enough, as he says, that it was used to signify the mode of being—if I may be allowed the phrase—of the individual which is a subject of predication, but can never itself be predicated of anything. In this sense it answers, for example, to the German *Gegenstand* in the terminology of Frege. But this is by no means the only sense of the word. Indeed, if it were, there would be a difficulty about the supreme Neoplatonic "hypostasis," the One. Since, according to Neoplatonism, nothing can be predicated of the One, it is not a subject of predicates at all. And many things which are not individuals at all—*e.g.*, space, time, number—are regularly said by Neoplatonic writers to be *ἐν ὑποστάσει*. In fact, in the commentaries of Simplicius, *ἐν ὑποστάσει* is repeatedly contrasted with *ἐν ἐπινοίᾳ* exactly as in scholastic Latin *in re* is with *in intellectu*. I mention this merely to illustrate the impossibility of fully discussing the problems connected with the ascription of personality either to God or to man until a really trustworthy account has been rendered of Greek Neoplatonist terminology. Liddell and Scott is defective on this matter, not altogether by the fault of the editors.

But in view of all the work which has been done in the last thirty years in the way of producing scholarly texts of Neoplatonist writers and in the elucidation of Neoplatonic metaphysics, we may perhaps hope that the projected revision of L. and S. will do something to remedy the defect. Meanwhile, Mr. Webb would, I believe, do well to supplement his very great knowledge of the literature of Theism by a serious study of Plotinus and Proclus. Even if one's main interest is in the scholasticism of the thirteenth century, one cannot afford to neglect those philosophers. St. Thomas is commonly thought of with reason as an Aristotelian, and the remarkably able neo-Thomists of our own day seem to make it a matter of duty in consequence to exalt Aristotle, the least original of all the major philosophers of the world, at the cost of men so much his superiors in originality as Plato and Descartes. But it is astonishing to note how much of the metaphysics of St. Thomas, if one only divests it of its verbal expression in the terminology of Aristotelian logic, is just Proclus. Indeed, the one definitely and exclusively Aristotelian feature in the metaphysics of Thomism seems to be also the one Thomistic tenet which it is quite hopeless to attempt to revive, the doctrine of the " incorruptibility " (Aristotle himself would say the " divinity ") of the material " heavens." This is, of course, a survival from the old nature-philosophy to be explained by the fact that Aristotle was an Ionian, and remained an Ionian at heart, even after twenty years in Plato's Academy.

I fear I am straying a little from my immediate subject. Let me hasten to get back to it with an expression of heartfelt thanks to Mr. Webb for the accuracy with which he has formulated the Christian attitude to the problem of personality in God. I have myself always felt that the language so common now in Christian circles about the importance of the doctrine that God is " *a* person " is not wholly consistent with the accepted confessions of Faith. It is at least hard to combine the two doctrines that God is a person and that God is a Trinity of persons in *one substantia*. Of course, one can try to make the combination sound less difficult by refusing to translate the word ὑπόστασις and contenting one's self with a transliteration. But if one does so, one usually goes on to explain *hypostasis* in some way which does less than justice to the independence of the three *hypostases*. One is almost certain to think of them merely as " aspects " of the one Divine " person," and from thinking of them as " aspects," it is not a very long step to degrade them to the level of " appearances " (in the depreciatory sense of the word). Hence it is very interesting to me to learn from Mr. Webb that the proposition that God is *a* person seems to have been originally characteristic of Socinianism, and that until well on in the nineteenth century only writers who are unfriendly to the doctrine

of the Trinity are in the habit of speaking of the personality *of* God. When one sees, as one often does, hesitation to call God *a* person treated as tantamount to a repudiation of Christianity, it is well to remember that the expression forms no part whatever of the vocabulary of traditional orthodoxy. I should have liked a little more information about Mr. Webb's own view of the "unity of substance" which orthodox Christianity asserts along with the distinction of persons. I think I can tell in general what Mr. Webb's view is, but I could have wished that he had been a little more explicit. I should like to know, for example, how his conception of Trinity and Unity compares with that of St. Thomas. I have a suspicion that it lays rather more stress on the real distinction and rather less on the real unity, but I am far from sure. Strictly speaking, no doubt, Mr. Webb only promises to deal with "personality in God," and it is not in the bond to say anything about the unity of substance in God. But I think I shall not be the only reader who will wish that Mr. Webb had allowed himself to expatiate.

If I may be allowed, where all is so excellent, to single out a particular part of Mr. Webb's book for special recommendation to all thoughtful men, I should like to express my particular appreciation of Lectures VI. to IX. In the first of these, the Lecture on *The Doctrine of a Finite God*, Mr. Webb is specially concerned with the theology of my valued friend the Dean of Carlisle. I hope I may say without offence that the Dean's work has always seemed to me to be of higher quality in ethics than in theology proper. In ethics he appears to me (and I cannot speak in words which, coming from me, would express higher admiration) the worthy successor of Butler and Price, and I wish to say so all the more emphatically that he has seen fit to speak with what I think asperity about some youthful utterances of my own. But his theology has always had in my own eyes the defect it has in Mr. Webb's; it offers me a God whom I can admire and love, but not one before whom I can feel absolute and utter reverence and adoration. I can only feel that for a God who is all that Plato called "the Good." And a God who is "finite" is necessarily something less than "the Good." I suspect, indeed, that the Dean does not really mean all that his language commits him to. His object is to deny that God is what philosophers have called "the Absolute," on the ground that this makes God the whole of what is and thus denies the reality of human personality, and so saps the foundations of a genuine morality. I should agree that the doctrine the Dean has in view—Spinozism, in fact—has the defect in question, and that it is a very serious one. But the blunder, as I take it, does not lie in the identification of God with the Absolute; it lies in the identification of the Absolute with the Real. Within the Real there is the room for and the

necessity for the distinction between the Absolute, the primary and original source of everything else, and the dependent and derivative. God is the Absolute, not in the sense that God is everything, or that we do not really stand in relations to God, but in the sense that there is nothing in any being other than God, not even in the Devil's power to rebel against God, which is not derived from God. As I understand the Dean, he does not really deny this. But his language might naturally lead his readers to suppose that he does mean to deny it, and if they understand him so, then I believe Mr. Webb to be right in saying that if they act consistently on their theories, they will end by becoming unable to worship.

Adherents of an eighteenth-century type of Theism are fond of arguing that refusal to be content with a "finite" Deity leads by logical consequence to the denial of the reality of evil, and therefore to an unethical attitude towards sin. It would be hard to show that, as a matter of historical fact, the theologians who have had most to say of the Divine infinitude have had a less keen sense of the poignancy of sin than the Dean of Carlisle or J. S. Mill (I do not say they have necessarily had a keener sense). Mr. Webb, at any rate, cannot be charged either with any attempt to deny the reality of evil or with a tendency to underrate the heinousness of sin. I would urge those who think that ethical considerations require them to derogate from the unique *aseity* of the Deity not to make up their minds finally on the question until they have studied the very careful discussion which Mr. Webb gives us in Lecture VIII. (*The Problem of Sin*), and the treatment given to the notions of Forgiveness, Justice, and Sacrifice in the closing lecture of the course (*Divine Personality*). I would also specially commend to the thoughtful Christian Lecture VII. (*The Problem of Creation*), with its excellently thought-out statement of the meaning of the doctrine of the intermediation of the Word in creation and its vindication of "mythology," in the Platonic sense of the word, as a necessary and proper vehicle for religious thought where it has to do with the meeting-point of the eternal and the temporal. Myth plays only a subordinate part in the Christian religion, as Mr. Webb says, because the place which would be assigned to it in the Platonic scheme is so largely filled by the historical narrative of our Lord's life among men. But when you come to ask questions about the historical which actual history provides no data for answering, as, for instance, when you try to picture to yourself the formation of our "world" in the unrecorded past, or the life of the risen and glorified Lord "at the right hand of the Father," you inevitably have to content yourself with a story, as Plato's Timaeus puts it, "as like the truth" as you can make it. Myth, in this sense, is thus the necessary "surrogate of history"—in fact, it is constantly

used in this way even by the chemist and the biologist. The attempts of the botanist to make us understand the life of a flower, or of a physiologist to make us understand the life of the phagocytes in our own bodies, to say nothing of the tales of the physicist about the relations between atoms and electrons, are every bit as "mythical" as anything any theologian has taught about the creation of the world.

No reader of Mr. Webb's earlier books will need to be told that he is careful throughout his work to insist on two points of fundamental importance, the impossibility of a separate "religion of Nature," detached from all that is characteristic in the distinctive teachings of the great positive religions of the world, and the impossibility of ever making the best system of philosophical thought replace actual religion. He is nowhere in happier vein than in his criticisms of the attempts of that slightly over-rated "superior person," Benedetto Croce, to eliminate religion from the educated mind in favour of his own philosophy. And he is admirably clear on the point that, though the religious life presents problems to the philosopher, just as art and science do, when all is said, philosophical theory remains philosophical theory, and religion remains religion, an attitude of the human mind towards reality as independent of any other, and as necessary for a complete humanity as morality or art or science. Mr. Webb is to be congratulated on so truly philosophical an apologia for Christian faith in an age in which some philosophers who ought to know better still seem to regard disbelief in Christianity, or even perhaps disbelief in God, as a qualification for being taken seriously in metaphysics. It is to be hoped that the promised second volume of Mr. Webb's Gifford Lectures will not be delayed much longer.

One can only condole with the author on the inferiority of the paper on which his work has had to be printed. There are a number of errors of the press, most of them corrected in the *Errata* slip. To the corrections given there one may add, p. 142, l. 9, *for* propice *read* proprie; p. 141, l. 20, *delete* the accent placed on the last letter of the word *cerchio ;* p. 68, l. 8 from below, *for* αὖ τοῦ *read* αὐτοῦ. Professor Burnet's name is misspelt in the *Index*.

A. E. Taylor.

St. Andrews

The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament: their Titles and Fragments. Collected, translated, and discussed by Montague Rhodes James, Litt.D., F.B.A., F.S.A., Provost of Eton College. London: S.P.C.K. 1920. Pp. xiv + 112. 5s. 6d. net.

Fabricius's *Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti* was published at Hamburg in 1713 (second edition, 1722), and is not always

easy to come by: the *Bibliotheca Apocrypha* of Dr. Székely had reached a first volume (Herder, Fribourg im Breisgau) in 1913—I do not know whether a second has yet appeared—which contains a general Introduction, and detailed treatment of the Sibylline Oracles, Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, the Apocalypse of Baruch, III. and IV. Esdras, the Book of Jubilees, the Epistles and Psalms of Solomon, IV. Maccabees, the various Testaments of the Patriarchs, the Prayer of Manasses, and the Ascension of Isaiah, and some similar lost books. I do not know of any other works covering the whole field of Old Testament Apocrypha, so that there was a need for such a general account as that now given by the Provost of Eton in the book under review.

In the short compass of 140 pages he deals with all the lost books of which notices or fragments have come down to us in the writings of the Fathers, or Grammarians, in Liturgies, or in fragmentary MSS. His list appears to be exhaustive; but it is something much better than a list, for it is in continuous and readable form, and there is enough account of each work both for the general reader who does not want to be referred to further authorities, and for the scholar who may desire to pursue deeper the indications given him by Dr. James. Nor is the work by any means only a compilation, however carefully carried out; there are many of Dr. James's original contributions to the subject, modestly introduced, in the way of skilful guesses at identification: often when a new apocryphal fragment has been published, he has remembered that some ancient writer has spoken of, and perhaps named, a work, hitherto supposed to be lost, which appears to fit the new discovery. The study of these documents perhaps owes more to Dr. James than to any other living scholar, and, to the credit of English scholarship, I think that Dr. Charles comes next!

Can we expect much addition to our knowledge of this class of literature, and if so, from what sources? It may be supposed that some further MSS. in Western libraries will yield a few fragments, but I think it is rather to the East that we must look. We do not seem yet to know fully what is to be found in the *Palœa*, which Dr. James describes as "a popular Bible-history of Byzantine times, which is the Eastern equivalent of the *Historia Scholastica* of Petrus Comestor"; I am not sure whether it now exists as a whole in Greek, or whether we shall have to wait for the publication of the Slavonic version, which may well be a long time hence. Then the *Synaxaria* of Egyptian origin, now extant in Arabic or Ethiopic, may probably be searched with advantage; they have not yet been fully published. I may give a small example of the kind of story which can be found in such a place.

Dr. James mentions two Melchizedek stories; in one he is the

son of a King Melchi* and a Queen Salem, in the other he is the grandson of Lamech, or rather miraculously born of Sopanima, the wife of Nir, Lamech's son. In addition to these genealogies, we have the conjecture of the Rabbis that Melchizedek was Shem in his old age; a Byzantine tradition that he was the son of Sides, founder of Sidon, and grandson of Ægyptus; and another, apparently with Jewish connections, that his father was Heraclas and his mother Astaroth (!) or Salathiel.

Turning to the Ethiopic *Synaxarium*, we find on the third day of *Paguemen*† (September 9) an account of Melchizedek, which describes him as the son of another Canaan, not the son of Ham, but a grandson of Shem, who was associated with his grandfather in the bestowal of Adam's bones in the very centre of the world—*i.e.*, Calvary. Once arrived there, Melchizedek was divinely ordained priest, and took twelve stones, and offered upon them sacrifice of bread and wine, elements supplied to him from heaven, the type of the New Law; and it was thence that he went out to meet the victorious Abraham returning from his victory over the Canaanitish kings.

The example is one of small importance; but it is worth alleging, as an indication of possibly fruitful lines of work. Of both the Alexandrian and the Ethiopic *Synaxaria* we have as yet only three or four months edited and translated, and until we see the whole we may always hope for further isolated pieces of valuable information.

STEPHEN GASELEE.

* Himself the grandson of another Salem, Queen of the city of the same name.

† *I.e.* (somewhat disguised), *αἱ ἐπαγόμεναι* [*ἡμέραι*].

NOTICES

RECENT BOOKS ON ENGLISH CHURCH ANTIQUITIES

(*a*) Winchester Cathedral Close: its Historical and Literary Associations. By John Vaughan, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Winchester. Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd. 1914.

Winchester Cathedral: its Monuments and Memorials. By the same author. Selwyn and Blount. 1919.

Canon Vaughan resides in one of the most pleasant Cathedral Closes in England. Before him rises the grand Cathedral pile which the architectural skill of modern masons, aided by the generosity and affection of the present generation of English Churchmen for this glorious minster, has made sound and good and firm to be handed down to future ages. On his right is the thirteenth-century entrance to the Deanery, which contains the Prior's Hall and much else of absorbing interest. Within the precincts he can see the stately monastic gateway that guarded the entrance to the Close, the picturesque gabled Cheyney Court, and other dwellings. It is the very same enclosure which for six hundred years was dedicated to the Benedictine duties of work and prayer, and which has witnessed more than one interesting event in English history. Here are memories of gentle saints like St. Swithun, of mighty Churchmen like St. Æthelwold, of learned men like Prior Godfrey, of statesmen-bishops such as Wykeham and Waynflete, as Richard Fox and Stephen Gardiner. Within the Close flourished, too, for many centuries a school of art and learning, at one time the most famous in Europe; while to the shrine of St. Swithun there flocked for many centuries thousands of pilgrims from every quarter.

Canon Vaughan is to be envied for his pleasant location, and no wonder is it that he should love to describe his surroundings and the great Church of which he is a dignitary. In his earlier book he traces back the story of the Close to very ancient days, to Celtic and Roman times, and records the changes that have taken place since the black-robed Benedictine brethren moved about the sacred enclosure, and all the memories that are associated with the Close. He wanders in the Canons' gardens, and many will envy him his knowledge of birds, his "feathered friends." The author gives a fascinating sketch of the literary associations of the Cathedral, describing Winchester as the Cradle of English Prose, where Alfred wrote his translations and the chronicle of his reign. The library contains several remarkable treasures in spite of the "cruel cormorants, who with their barbarous beaks and greedy claws rent, tore, and tattered inestimable pieces of antiquity," and all book-lovers will revel in the author's admirable account of the *incunabula*, charters, manuscripts, and volumes that still survive.

Canon Vaughan's second book is the result of the most careful research. It deals with all the monuments and memorials which the Cathedral contains, and no other Cathedral contains such a vast store of the memorials of the illustrious dead as does Winchester. Not even Westminster Abbey can rival it, at least as regards the early period of English history. It was a gigantic task to collect information concerning all these monuments of departed worthies, of kings and priests, bishops and cardinals, abbots and monks, lords and laymen, and admirably, with much care, accuracy, and diligence, has Canon Vaughan performed his task.

Everyone knows those curious mortuary chests which stand upon the top of the choir-screen. These are believed to be unique in this country, and have a romantic history. It is remarkable that after all the changes and chances of over a thousand years, after the shameful outrages of Cromwellian troopers during the Civil War, when some of the chests were broken open and the bones scattered over the pavement, there should still exist the bones of Kinegils, the first Christian King of Wessex, of King Cnut and his Queen Emma who underwent the cruel ordeal of walking with bare feet on red-hot ploughshares in the Saxon minster, of Kenulpe and Egbert, and many others; and though the bones have been somewhat mixed, we are glad to be assured by our author that these chests do really contain the remains of the persons whose names appear in the inscriptions. Especially interesting are the seven chantries, the most magnificent in the kingdom, built in memory of Bishop William of Edyndon, the inventor of the perpendicular architectural style, William of Wykeham, and other worthies, whose names cannot be mentioned here. It is well known that Cardinal Beaufort did not deserve the condemnation heaped upon him by Shakespeare, and his character has been vindicated by a modern writer. Not all the individuals whose memories are preserved in the cathedral are known to fame, and Canon Vaughan must have found it a very difficult task to recover details of the lives of very many whose names are here recorded, in spite of Anthony Wood's *Athena Oxonienses* and the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Bishops and deans, pre-Reformation and post-Reformation, prebendaries, college and cathedral worthies, literary men and women, soldiers, musicians, noblemen and gentlemen, city fathers and others, all live again in these pages. Nor are quaint inscriptions lacking. We are glad to learn the location of the curious rhyme:

> "On earth she was a Martha in behaviour,
> But Mary-like shee resteth with her Saviour."

Winchester is indeed fortunate in its historian, and Canon Vaughan is to be congratulated upon the satisfactory completion of an arduous and useful work.

(*b*) The Story of Purton: a Collection of Notes and Hearsay. Gathered by Ethel M. Richardson. With Illustrations. Bristol: G. W. Arrowsmith, Ltd. 1919. 7s. 6d. net.

Theology deals with religion, with the spiritual activities of man, and concerns itself with man's expression of religion in art, and especially in ecclesiastical architecture, that sublime science whereby devout minds have shown their aspirations towards the infinite, their reverence for divine things in their worship of God. Not only in mighty minsters and great cathedrals, in "long-drawn aisle and fretted vault," is this reverence evident, but in many a humble village church, beautiful beyond words, we see how the masons and artificers of old expressed their reliance upon the Great Architect of the universe. When these Gothic shrines were in building it was not the great men, the nobles, and princes, who did the work. It was the men of the village who did the best they could to make the church, their spiritual home, the great house of their parish, as fair and beautiful as they knew how. They wrought in homely style, sweet, natural, and unaffected, putting their hearts into their work, and producing those lovely churches which we admire so much to-day.

Especially is this evident in the beautiful church of the village of Purton which Mrs. Richardson so lovingly describes in this charming

book. As all who know it will remember, it is peculiar in having a western tower and central spire—there are only two other examples in England. Built originally in Norman times it shows features of every period of Gothic architecture, and Aubrey conjectures that it must have been "a place of great devotion as appeared by those many niches in the walles within and without to set images in." It is indeed a "glorious" church, and the present writer visited it under the guidance of the late Vicar, Mr. Veysey, who loved every stone of it, and used to point out the reclusorium, the old glass, mural paintings, and many other objects of interest in the building. These the author describes, and then conducts us to the village and tells the story of its manor and manor house, one of the most perfect in England, Purton House, the writer's home, Restrop House, a good example of Elizabethan architecture, recounting with tender affection all the numerous interesting details of village life. Many histories of villages have been published, but few with greater charm than this pleasant book. The only thing it lacks is an index.

(*c*) Hexham and its Abbey. By Charles Clement Hodges and John Gibson, F.C.S. With 46 illustrations. Hexham: Gibson and Son. London: B. T. Batsford. 1917.

The writers of this book have been intimately associated in the study of the history and antiquities of Hexham for more than thirty years, and have considered it their duty to record all that they have discovered with regard to the early and more recent history of Hexham and its abbey. They seem to have had special opportunities of witnessing discoveries made in their time, and have done well in writing all that they have noted. Much has been written about Hexham and its noble church, its ecclesiastical and historical associations, including the two volumes issued by the Surtees Society, but it is well to have the story again pleasantly told in this little book of about 150 pages, and especially to have the record of recent discoveries. It cannot take the place of Canon Raine's volumes on the Priory of Hexham. Its early story is told by Bede, who records that in 674 Queen Etheldrida, afterwards abbess of the church and monastery of Ely, gave the town to her favourite, St. Wilfrid, for the purpose of erecting a religious house. It was accorded the privilege of Sanctuary, and became the seat of a bishopric, of which St. Wilfrid became Bishop. In Norman times a company of Austin Canons was established here in 1113, who used Wilfrid's church until they were able to erect a new one. There have been many architectural changes which we have no space to record, and some terrible mutilations by so-called "restorers" in 1858, when they swept away the eastern aisle and were guilty of other vandalism. The writers of this book have given a clear and good account of the architectural history of the interesting church, and this portion of the work is extremely well done. They have also thought fit to add much information about the modern town, thus converting their work into a guide book. Antiquaries and theologians will scarcely require to be told about hydros, golf courses, or even the "Gem Palace," which we presume is a kinema. However, this is a detail. An excellent feature of the book is its wealth of illustrations. These are numerous and admirably produced, and one is sorely tempted to make a pilgrimage at once to this venerable town and noble church, and with the aid of this book rejoice in contemplating its wonderful perfections.

P. H. Ditchfield.

THE SPIRIT: GOD AND HIS RELATION TO MAN CONSIDERED FROM THE STANDPOINT OF PHILOSOPHY, PSYCHOLOGY, AND ART. By B. H. Streeter and others. Pp. xii + 381. Macmillan. 1919. 10s. 6d. net.

It is doubtful whether a volume of essays by several hands is the most satisfactory method of approaching the more important problems of religion. There is, indeed, ample precedent for such joint productions as the volume which lies before us. We have had *Essays and Reviews*, *Lux Mundi*, *Cambridge Theological Essays*, *Foundations*, and many others.

While such volumes are in the making the contributors can meet to discuss and criticize each other's work, and when they are published the reader has the points at issue presented to him from a variety of angles. Unquestionably these are very solid advantages.

But against them must be set the limitations as to space inevitably imposed upon each contributor. The reader is apt to feel that no one of them has been able to say quite enough to make it certain what he really means, and accordingly lays down the book with a slight sense of disappointment.

The purpose of Canon Streeter's latest volume is to " put forward a conception of the Spirit of God which is definite but not scholastic, and which is capable of affording an intellectual basis both for a coherent philosophy of the universe, and for a religion passionate and ethical, mystical and practical."

The aim is a noble one. But we do not think that it has been completely achieved. The essays contain many valuable and stimulating thoughts. But it is precisely in point of definiteness that they appear to us to fail. It is not clear whether the writers believe in a Holy Spirit who is really personal, but is not to be identified either with the Father or the Son, to whom prayers may rightly be addressed; or whether " The Spirit " means to them no more than " a clear effluence of the glory of the Almighty "—that is to say, an outpouring of the Divine Wisdom which may be hypostatized (as in the canonical apocrypha) provided that such personification be not taken quite seriously.

The essays are of unequal merit, and we are disposed to put Captain Hadfield's (*The Psychology of Power*) first, and Mr. Clutton-Brock's (*Spiritual Experience* and *Spirit and Matter*) last upon the list.

Space forbids any attempt at detailed criticism, but it is a curious omission in Canon Streeter's *Christ the Constructive Revolutionary* that there is no reference to St. Matt. xxiii. 2-3. The principle of authority in religion has never been more uncompromisingly maintained, and the words imply that what was wrong in the Pharisees was not their intellectual outlook so much as their conduct. This is the exact opposite of Canon Streeter's view of them.

It is impossible to dissociate this volume from the two which have preceded it—*Immortality* (Macmillan, 1917) and *Concerning Prayer* (Macmillan, 1918)—and it will be worth while to try to estimate the net value of their joint contribution to the religious thought of the day.

The three books contain thirty-three essays by sixteen hands. The largest contributors are Miss Dougall and Canon Streeter, who have seven and five to their credit respectively. The essayists are not all members of the Church of England, and, as is natural, their standpoint differs considerably. It will not be possible to do more than indicate some of the characteristics common to them all.

The motive which has prompted their undertaking is beyond praise. They all accept Christ as the supreme authority in religion and ethics

alike, and are convinced that His greatest triumphs in the world are yet to come. That in itself is much. They are also convinced that religion has not only nothing to fear from clear and accurate thinking, but that as it must needs appeal to every part of our nature, no small part of its welfare depends on careful thinking on the part of its adherents. And they do not attempt to claim finality for their own conclusions.

They agree in holding that Christianity has long been and still is largely paralyzed by a timid conservatism. It persists in clinging to traditional modes of thought and expression which are now outworn. There are probably few who would challenge the contention entirely.

But it is at this point that our authors lay themselves most open to criticism. We think that they all (and especially the two of whose mind we are in the fullest possession) have failed to appreciate the value of tradition. It is easy to speak with half-contemptuous pity of "pious dames and ministers of religion." Probably we have all sometimes been exasperated by them—as Nietzsche was. But we owe them a great deal. Our principal reason for believing that any remote historical event really took place always is tradition. Traditional piety and its practices may often strike us as narrow and conventional. But it has preserved the Christian religion through the ages. To it more than to anything else we all (not excepting Miss Dougall) owe the opportunity which we now enjoy of trying to be Christians.

And has the Church really been more unreasonably conservative than many other things? How do orthodox theologians compare with physicians or with lawyers? In our own country, has Convocation been more hostile to new ideas than the Admiralty or the War Office?

Unreasonable conservatism is not peculiar to the Church. It is a very deeply rooted tendency of the human mind from which the Church has not escaped as well as might have been hoped.

The general outlook of the writers may be compared with that of the author of the epistle *To the Hebrews*. He, too, had to do what he could to steer religion through a crisis. We must welcome the courage and sincerity with which Canon Streeter and his colleagues have addressed themselves to their tasks. Their books appear to have been well received, and it is to be hoped that they will enjoy a wide circulation during the next few years. In ten years' time we may be able to see more clearly than we do now what things have been shaken and must be removed, and what cannot be shaken and will remain. The residuum may prove to be larger than some people anticipate.

R. H. Malden.

Varieties of English Religion. By E. C. Hoskyns, M.A., Fellow and Dean of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Pp. 29. S.P.C.K., 1920.

This admirable little pamphlet consists of four addresses—"Popular Religion," "The Religion of the Public Schools," "Romanism," and "Anglicanism"—delivered by the author in his College Chapel during the Easter Term of 1919. They are clear and incisive, and calculated to make all those who heard them think. We are very glad that they have been made available for a wider audience. A particularly valuable feature is the attention which they call to the "foreign links" possessed by the Church of England, and we should like to suggest to the author that he further develop this theme (which he is peculiarly well fitted to handle) on some subsequent occasion. The starting-point might well be the correspondence of Archbishop Wake.

Where extreme brevity has been necessary, criticism is perhaps hardly legitimate. But we are inclined to think that Public School religion is a little better than Mr. Hoskyns's estimate of it, and that the voice of Rome is in reality even more uncertain than that of Anglicanism. We are at one with him in his contention that the Church of England cannot bless popular religion as it stands. But what else has the Church of Rome ever done? There is probably no more naïve announcement in the world than the inscription upon the walls of St. Peter's, which records that Pius IX. "desideria totius catholici orbis explevit" by promulgating the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

SPRING-TIME AND OTHER ESSAYS. By Sir Francis Darwin. London: John Murray. Pp. 242. 7s. 6d.

One of the first thoughts that occurs to the reader of this pleasant little book is that, if R. L. Stevenson is to be believed, the writer of it must be among the happiest of human beings. For him, most certainly, the world is "full of a number of things." It is well known that Charles Darwin, towards the end of his life, lamented that his exclusive devotion to scientific studies had killed his love of literature and the fine arts. This is plainly not the case with his son. For although the book before us does indeed begin and end with a botanical essay, the pages between the two deal with a great variety of subjects, including essays on the names of characters in fiction, biographical studies of Thomas Hearne, Sir George Airy, Sir Joseph Hooker, and Sydney Smith; a paper on Old Instruments of Music; an account of St. Bartholomew's Hospital; and a study of the personality and character of Dickens. Of these, the most important is the review of a book by Francis Galpin on Old English Instruments of Music, which gives Sir Francis the opportunity for imparting much curious information on a subject which will be new to most readers. He tells the story of the "cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music," of the lute, the violin, harpsichord, clavichord, and virginal, etc., with illustrations of most of the instruments concerned, and an elaborate account of how they are made, and how to play upon them. Those of us who have lately suffered under the infliction of a "jazz-band" will be disposed to agree with the medieval writer whom he quotes as saying of drums that "the devil must have had the devising and making of them." It is amusing to read that the violin, when first introduced into England in 1660, was spoken of as a "cheerful and spritely instrument," and that in T. Mace's *Musick's Monument* (published 1676) the lute is solemnly defended from various "false and ignorant outcries" against it, such as "that one had as good keep a Horse as a Lute for Cost," and, "most childish of all," that it is "out of Fashion."

The biographical essays are, to speak the truth, mostly rather dull. That on Sir Joseph Hooker, about whom Sir Francis had, of course, special qualifications for writing, has not much in it of interest from any except a purely scientific point of view, and the same criticism applies to the essay on Sir George Airy, President of the Royal Society and Astronomer-Royal in 1835. On the other hand, the essay on Sydney Smith is full of delightful quotations from his letters. One likes to think how he, who was so delighted with the advent of railway travelling as having abolished distance—"scratch that out of the catalogue of human ills"—would have welcomed the invention of the motor-car and the aeroplane, if only as a means of getting more quickly away from the country. For, while much has changed since he wrote, one suspects that

he would not have found rural life much more amusing now than it was in 1840.

The botanical essay with which the book ends is somewhat too technical for the general public, but even the non-scientific reader will be interested by the account of the wind-fertilization of plants in the first essay, and by the fascinating analogy which Sir Francis draws between the instruments of an orchestra and the different plants, shrubs, and flowering trees which make up what he calls the " great symphony of colour " unfolded by the spring-time. The whole first essay is indeed delightful to read, and full of that sense of the charm and beauty of Nature which Sir Francis is so eminently fitted to interpret to his generation.

SARAH BAILEY.

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL SERVICE. Being the Report of a Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury. London: S.P.C.K. 1920. 1 vol., pp. 70. 1s.

This Report is a natural corollary to the Report of the Archbishops' Fifth Committee of Inquiry, " Christianity and Industrial Problems." The terms of reference were " to consider and report upon the ways in which clergy, Church-workers, and Church-people generally can best co-operate with the State in all matters concerning the social life of the community." The Report deals first with actual opportunities of social service, and is then divided into a consideration of (1) the clergy, (2) the laity, and (3) the parish in regard to it. There is a note on rural problems, and four Appendices which form perhaps the most valuable part of the Report as a whole. The book is a practical guide to those who, having read the Report on " Christianity and Industrial Problems," wish to take definite action.

We welcome the frank recognition throughout that the Church must care for the whole man—body, mind, and spirit—and that the line drawn in the past between secular and religious service has often been fictitious. There is nothing in the Report that is better than the frank statement that the Church of England cannot rightly confine its social activities to the more or less limited circle of those who are attached to it; that this may very easily become, not co-operation with the State, but self-centred competition against it. " The Church must co-operate, not compete, with the State, and it must accept the responsibility for the fullest social welfare not merely of the select few but of the whole community." The other most striking comment, which will come as an entirely new idea to many readers, is worth quoting in full, though the argument should be read in its context and general application. Speaking of social service by churchwomen among working-class women, the Committee state: " While it is in the highest degree desirable that married women with young families should not be wage-earners, we must recognize that if their earnings put them in a position to pay for competent care of their children, they are just as much justified in providing that care and choosing outside work for themselves as the professional woman or the woman of means, who, although a mother, spends a large part of her time on committees or in philanthropic work. Thus, in advocating prohibition of wage-earning employment of mothers of infants, justice to the mother must not be forgotten in care for the child."

There is one point on which the Committee seems to lay wrong emphasis. In the first part of the Report detailed description is given of the training in social science required for the clergy both before and

after ordination, and constant reference is made to the necessity of such knowledge and experience in clergy and laity alike. Yet the requirements laid down for the clergy before ordination amount to nothing more than what is obligatory on all educated men. One looks through the Report in vain for any suggestion that it is the business of public schools and Universities to equip all their young citizens with an elementary knowledge of civics and of the practical implications of citizenship in an age of industrial upheaval. It is a pity that the Report, which will be, and deserves to be, widely read, assumes that prospective ordinands from the larger Universities will continue to be supplied with a general education which includes no such knowledge. The recommendations for the further training of clergy after ordination are wise and necessary; at the same time it must be noted that the Committee disclaims any desire to see the clergy trained simply as economic experts. If, however, after ordination as well as before, the deacon or young priest is to continue systematic study of Church doctrine and modern thought, education, practical psychology, Pastoralia, the provisions of this Report for his training in Social Science leave no time for the proper place to be given to these other equally important subjects. This comment merely raises the whole question of the length of training necessary for a man entering the ministry, and the Committee could not, of course, deal with this in full. The Report is, however, most interesting when it touches on subjects strictly outside its terms of reference; for instance, in the argument brought forward in the fifth section in favour of large parishes corresponding with the area of local government, such as the county, borough, or area of the Rural District Council.

T. W. Pym.

BILLING AND SONS, LTD., PRINTERS, GUILDFORD, ENGLAND